University of New Mexico
UNM Digital Repository

English Language and Literature ETDs | Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Fall 11-13-2017

Devilish Leaders, Demonic Parliaments, and Diabolical Rebels: The Political Devil and Nationalistic Rhetoric from Malmesbury to Milton

Karra HK Shimabukuro
University of New Mexico

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/engl_etds

Part of the Literature in English, British Isles Commons

Recommended Citation
Shimabukuro, Karra HK. "Devilish Leaders, Demonic Parliaments, and Diabolical Rebels: The Political Devil and Nationalistic Rhetoric from Malmesbury to Milton." (2017). https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/engl_etds/215

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Language and Literature ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Karra Shimabukuro

Candidate

English

Department

This dissertation is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Dissertation Committee:

Anita Obermeier, Chairperson

Carmen Nocentelli

Yulia Ryzhik

Jeffrey Shoulson (outside reader)

Devilish Leaders, Demonic Parliaments, and Diabolical Rebels: The
Political Devil and Nationalistic Rhetoric from Malmesbury to Milton

by

Karra Shimabukuro

B.F.A. Theatre Arts, East Carolina University
M.S. Ed. Adolescent Education- English, The College of
Staten Island of the City University of New York
M.A. English Literature, Middlebury College

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
English

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

December 2017

Dedication

For Mom. Always.

Acknowledgements

I am infinitely grateful for my committee's kindness and support. Dr. Anita Obermeier for crafting many of my ideas and approaches to studying medieval literature. She always had faith in me and knew exactly how to get me where I needed to go. Dr. Carmen Nocentelli's ideas about globalization and how to read the untold stories in the early modern period forever changed how I viewed this period and the texts in it. She helped me find my voice and audience for this project. Dr. Yulia Ryzhik assisted me in distinguishing a key argument in the text, the difference between Englishness and Britishness, and how defining both was key to understanding the devil in these works. A special thanks to Dr. Shoulson who saw this project from beginning to end.

I am grateful to the support I have received throughout this process including Dr. Will Banks's initial belief that I could do this at all, my writing group, my online support network, specifically #medievaltwitter, and my fellow grad students who reached out and buoyed me up when needed.

Specifically, @jenandjanstwits @lauravarnam @AbsP @LaraDodds @joshua_r_eyler @b_hawk @raulpacheco @SGUYBRAY @JonathanHsy @thanatos_kalos @Lady_Historian @divafancypants @JulianDarius @kelly_j_baker @TheTattooedProf @MedievalPhDemon @TheMedievalDrK @ndiscenza1 @RobertaDMagnani @SLevelt

Thanks also need to go to Dana Och, Wickham Clayton, Ross Garner, Robin Gray Nicks, and Linda J. Holland-Toll for introducing me to the academic world early on and supporting me throughout.

I would not have made it through this process without my mother’s voice in my head, the daily support of Nehi, and regular tattoo visits with Matt.

Devilish Leaders, Demonic Parliaments, and Diabolical Rebels: The Political Devil and Nationalistic Rhetoric from Malmesbury to Milton

by
Karra Shimabukuro

B.F.A., Theatre Arts, East Carolina University, 1998
M.S. Ed., Adolescent Education- English, The College of Staten Island of the City University of New York, 2004
M.A., English Literature, Middlebury College, 2010
Ph.D., English, University of New Mexico, 2017

Abstract

Throughout its history, England and its writers have created its national identity out of thin air. Some writers such as William of Malmesbury and John Milton have consciously constructed their imagined Englands, while other authors during the medieval and early modern periods are subtler, but whose works reflect the historical and cultural moment, the fears, desires, and anxieties about kingship, tyranny, heirs, and stability, that existed during that time. Little scholarship has focused on the devil's role in these constructions, his political nature, and how this nature is used in constructing nationalistic arguments. This devil can lead kings, nobles, and clergymen astray, resulting in devilish leadership, as seen in Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum* but devils can be humans who act as devilish leaders, as seen William Shakespeare's *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth.* Part of the danger of human devils is that they reflect fears that the threat, the devil, could be anyone. *Þe Deulis Parlement*and *Paradise Lost*both feature actual devils, who counter the authority of God and his structures, tempt others with their demonic speech, attempt to create their own demonic structures, and incite rebellion. It is worth noting that while Chapter One focuses on threats to the nation, as does Chapter Four,

Chapters Two and Three construct the demonic as the people and structures who counter the power structure and authority of the monarchy, not the collective of the people.

Contents

Acknowledgements iv

Abstract vi

Introduction: England's Political Devil 1

The Political Devil 2

Past scholarship 11

Defining England's Nationalism 16

Methodology and Scope 21

Chapter One: Devilish Leaders and Inspirational Role Models in the Imagined England of William of Malmesbury's Gesta regum Anglorum 29

Imagined England 31

Devilish Leadership 40

Table 1: Terms Used to Demonize Figures in Gesta regum Anglorum 43

Demonic Kings 44

The Consequences of Devilish Leadership 49

Weak and Bedeviled Men 51

Devilish Religious Leaders 55

Inspirational Figures and the Restoration of Order 58

Chapter Two: The Democratic Collective as Demonic Parliament in A Song Called Þe Deulis Perlament, OR Parlamentum of Feendis 65

The History of Parliament 67

Table 2: Named English Parliaments 1258-1536 72

A History of Infernal Councils 73

The Democratic Collective as Demonic 84

Demonic Creation as Mimesis 85

Table 3: Terms Used to Describe Devil and Fallen Devils in Þe Deulis Perlament 87

Only the English Demonize Parliament 98

Chapter Three: Diabolical Rebellions in 1 Henry IV and Macbeth 102

Past Scholarship 109

Rebellion is Diabolic 113

How Language and Speech Construct the Demonic 116

Heroes as Mechanism of the Restoration of Monarchial Authority 136

Chapter Four: Paradise Lost's Reformed Devil 141

History of Paradise Lost 144
Paradise Lost's Nationalism 152
Devilish Leadership 153
Language Constructs the Demonic 157
Infernal Councils 165
Diabolical Rebels 185
The Son as Divine and Meritorious Role Model 194
The Mechanism of the Restoration of Order is Obedience 202
Conclusion: "Hell is empty and all the devils are here" 207
Works Cited 216
Primary Texts 216
Secondary Texts 223

Introduction: England's Political Devil

Throughout history, the people of England have most often defined themselves by contrast: the Britons, the forbears of the Welsh, against the Saxons the Saxons against the Normans. After the Conquest of 1066, Normans adapted and changed to distinguish themselves, and their nation, as a unified nation, separate from the England that existed before, and from the Norman and French sources of authority. England's nationalism is often misunderstood as static, defined as one fixed emanation; however, history shows that it is constantly in flux, dynamically responding to internal and external influences. Throughout this *longue duree,* from the Anglo-Saxons to the Restoration, the English people demonize ethnically different alterns,[1] Welsh, Scots, Irish, Moors, Jews then construct them as adversaries, threats to English culture and its people. These others become a *feindbild*, the image of a common enemy, to unite against. In English literature, the devil—as well as the figures associated with him—is the ultimate altern. These alterns represent a threat to the individuals who make up the English people and to the larger power systems that constitute the English nation. They are a danger because of their ability to incite rebellion and lead people astray. Even though the devil is the ultimate altern, threat, enemy, what do we do when the devil is not portrayed as an ethnically and visually different altern? Does not conform to the common understanding?

---

[1] As the 2017 International Medieval Congress: Leeds' theme of "Otherness" proved, use of "Other" and application of Said's work perpetuate colonial biases and prejudices. Postcolonial theory has moved away from the use of "Other" as a racist term, reinforcing racist ideals and approaches, so except for rare instances, I use the preferred "altern" which is imperfect, but is a better choice. Altern may prove in the future, as problematic as "Other," but I chose to use it and marginalized groups as they do not currently carry the colonial baggage of "Other."

How do we understand the context of the devil when he is constructed as the enemy not of a person but an entire nation, and has an inherently political function?[2]

The Political Devil

The English devil is an inherently political figure. He is not the common understanding of the Christian devil, and he is not the devil of folklore, although he functions similarly, as the vehicle for the fears, desires, and concerns of the general populace about what defines English national identity. Yet the English political devil cannot be wholly divorced from these two portrayals, he often displays characteristics of both, and as we will see, there is slippage between these understandings of the devil and the English political devil and between the portrayal of these political devils and devil figures who more closely resemble the common understandings. One of the reasons these aspects of the political devil have not been studied is that work on the devil is often limited by periodization and discipline. Past scholarship may consider the devil in a single work such as *Paradise Lost* or within a specific historical period such as the Middle Ages, but it does not take a *longue duree* view, thus not identifying these larger patterns and trends. These patterns include the political devil being portrayed as actual devil figures, as we see with the devils in *Þe Deulis Perlament,* and Satan in *Paradise Lost,* and human figures constructed as devils, as seen in *Gesta regum Anglorum, 1 Henry IV,* and *Macbeth.* This dissertation reveals this ABAB pattern of when devilish figures appear. In *Gesta*, *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth,* human leaders lead their nation astray

---

[2] Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* argues that a nation is a social construct, and artificial construction that is the product of the imagination of the people who conceive of themselves as part of that group. Just because this community is an artificial social construct does not mean that it is not real, "nation-ness, as well as nationalism, are cultural artefacts of a particular kind" (Anderson 4).

through their verbal rhetoric which leads to demonic acts. *Paradise Lost* also follows this pattern, but using not a devilish leader, but an actual devil as a leader. *Þe Deulis Perlament,* focuses on verbal rhetoric, and style, but perhaps because of the unsophisticated nature of the devils who employ it, it meanders through misunderstanding throughout the text, never accomplishing anything. This long view also reveals that while plays may contain "a" or even multiple devil figures, these figures are not always the political English devil, as evidenced in Shakespeare's plays. *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth* also highlight the slippage that can occur between these two sets of devilish figures, ones that conform to the common understanding and ones that complicate these understandings. One realization revealed through this analysis that crosses periodization and genres is that the devil is an artificial construct, constructed by specific groups, through specific speech, to further specific aims. Devilish figures both reveal themselves as devils through speech and instigate diabolical rebellion through their speech. These devils often act as part of a collective, with both the structure of the group, and the danger this group of voices presents, constructed as demonic. There is also an emphasis on the rhetorical relationship between the demonic and narrative, whether it is authors such as Malmesbury and Milton using demonic figures to write a history of England or the narratives devils themselves tell to retell their own histories, in order to remake their current realities. In texts such as *Gesta, 1 Henry IV, Macbeth,* and *Paradise Lost,* the English political devil is often shown together with devilish figures that are familiar through a variety of texts and portrayals. Both sets of devilish signifiers serving an oft-ignored political role in identifying England's internal enemies like the Welsh, Scots, and

Irish, as well as more external threats like Moors and Jews. These enemies are not just threats to the English people, but the structure of the English nation.

Within this dissertation, I define the political devil as a figure tied to both political structures, such as Parliament, and physical structures that indicate or constrain movement or revolution as they are seen in texts, stairways, gates, walls, cities. The texts I analyze have two types of physical structures, heavenly ones that are presented as the real, the ideal, and demonic attempts to recreate these structures. These structures are intertwined with leaderships, the monarchy, and the stability and success of the nation. A nation that has strong structures at its foundation, its core, is one that will be successful. The political devil not only attempts a mimesis of these acceptable structures but also seeks to destabilize and destroy the "true" and real structures. He has several tools at his disposal for doing so. The devil attempts to create simulacra of the "real" structures he knew in heaven. He also uses his persuasive, ambiguous, and deceptive speech to convince others to act in a manner that will result in this destabilization and destruction. This speech is constructed as demonic because it also leads to rebellion, which fractures the ideal, role model society and its structures, as well as countering the natural, divine order. The English political devil drags down his followers with him, with their destruction necessary in order to restore the righteous order at the end of the text.

This dissertation analyzes the political devil figure in English literature crossing periodization and discipline and paying special attention to rhetorical statements. First, I identify the common understanding of the devil in English literature, then unpack how figures and texts that do not conform to these understandings, or complicate our understanding of this popular image, make statements about political systems and

national identity. On the surface, this political devil is not the Biblical one, although both have political natures. Reading the Biblical devil as a consistent narrative is a misreading. The serpent in Genesis, the fallen angel Lucifer in Isaiah, the Adversary in Job, Satan in Maccabees, and the dragon in Revelation, are all separate figures that later Church fathers such as Justin Martyr condense into a single figure for didactic purposes. The Biblical devil is always the enemy, the adversary, and while different books of the Bible highlight different aspects of the devil, I base my understanding of the devil's political nature and function on 1 and 2 Maccabees.

The devil rebels against the authority of God, and tempts others away from God and heaven. In Isaiah, Lucifer is described as the one "which didst weaken the nations" (*Douai-Rheims Bible* 14:12) further linking him to political structures. He plays the same role in the Gospel of Matthew when he tries to tempt Jesus in the wilderness by showing him holy cities and kingdoms, encouraging conquest and rule. Zechariah presents Satan as an adversarial figure whose purpose is to counter God's plan, as does the Book of Chronicles. In the Book of Job, he is the "adversary," a term most clearly understood as prosecuting attorney, and part of the Court of Heaven. In the Book of Job, the Septuagint scholars use "ho Diabolos, 'Devil'" with the translators using to mean "an adversary" not a specific figure. The Septuagint translators also used the word "epiboulos" which translates as "plotter" is used in 1 and 2 Samuel and Kings, and later, "antikeimenos," "adversary." In the Book of Esther, diabolos references a human adversary and in 1 Maccabees Jerusalem, and its people become "a troublesome devil" to Israel (1 Macc. 1.36) (Kelly 30). The use of these terms, with political connotations points to an implied understanding of the political nature of the devil.

In *The Origin of Satan* (1995), Elaine Pagels takes the argument one step further stating that in Maccabees, Satan is synonymous with the internal political threats that rebels represent to political structures. In 1 Maccabees, the term “satan” is used to describe the traitorous and rebellious Jews and because of this, the term “satan” become synonymous with “opponent.” “Around the time Job was written (c. 550 B.C.E.), however, other Biblical writers invoked the *satan* to account for division within Israel” (Pagels 42). This same usage is seen in 1 Chronicles where “satan is invoked to account for the division and destruction that King David’s order[3] aroused within Israel” (Pagels 43). Satan as representative of internal conflict and fracturing is seen in Zechariah (Pagels 43-4). Zechariah goes further and does not just apply satan to internal conflicts but specifically rural peoples[4] who challenge the authority of the high priests (Pagels 44). Pagels marks Zechariah as the turning point in Satan’s characterization from a mechanism of God’s court to a more “sinister” and internal threat. She argues that this is the context that the events of Maccabees must be read through, one that characterizes internal threats as demonic. The Intertestamental Period was defined by corruption and conflict between Maccabeans and Babylonian Jews attempting to return to Palestine (Gabel and Wheeler 171). During this time, there were also many factions of Jews, groups that each struggled to redefine “the identity of the ‘New Israel’” (Gabel and Wheeler 178). The Maccabean War was from 167-164 B.C.E and resulted in subgroups breaking off, each fighting for “its own version of tradition and continuity” which led to

[3] Of taxation

[4] Tangential to this idea is a debate that is ongoing regarding whether or not Jew or Judean is the proper term to use in scholarship with one privileging religion and the other culture. For more on this see “Jew and Judean: Have Scholars Erased the Jews from Antiquity?” *A Marginalia Forum,* a multi-authored response. 26 August 2014.

both "internal dissension" and the ongoing conflicts with outside forces (Gabel and Wheeler 179). 1 Maccabees is a story of a just, moral, and necessary, revolt against an unjust king (Pagels 45), a lesson we will see revisited in Chapter Three with Shakespeare's *1 Henry IV, Macbeth,* and in Chapter Four and *Paradise Lost*. After these events, revolts and rebellions become more radical and "these dissidents began increasingly to invoke the *satan* to characterize their Jewish opponents" (Pagels 47). Because of this, the term "satan" become synonymous with "opponent": Maccabees reinforces the connections between resistance and Satan as an internal political opponent, one who was once with "the nation" and now fights against it (Pagels 47). Jews who fought against the nation were also often accused "of having been seduced by the power of evil, whom they call by many names—Satan, Beelzebub, Semihazah, Azazel, Belial, Prince of Darkness" (Pagels 47). In this context, Satan was not just the Adversary of Job, an external force and enemy, he was also an "intimate enemy—one's trusted colleague, close associate, brother" (Pagels 49), an internal traitor. Most Biblical references describe the devil as the enemy of man, God, natural order, and political structures.[5] He is an internal threat that endangers the whole.

---

[5] This characterization continues in 2 Maccabees, the Book of Daniel, and Falvius Josephus's *Antiquities of the Jews.*

The Devil You Know

The common understanding of this Christian,[6] Western devil is that he is dark in color, with animal traits, and this visual difference[7] serves to warn good Christians of the danger he represents. He is also associated with marginalized groups such as Jews, Moors, and women who counter patriarchal authority and power structures. He tempts, seduces, and deceives in his defining role as an adversary to good, Christian English men and women. Most often, women are the focus of his attentions, and as such are divided into a clear binary: saintly women who are so pious they must be brought down by the devil, and (particularly in the early modern period) secular women who seek powers from the devil as another way to challenge patriarchal authority. This devil is often understood to be confined to hell after the harrowing, incapable of returning to Earth himself instead sending his minions to act in his name. There are many names for the devil. Lucifer, or light-bearer, is the name he had before his fall, but is also used to refer to the king of hell. Satan is the name given to the devil after the fall, but often describes a devil other than Lucifer. In some narratives, it is Lucifer who rules over hell; in others, it is Satan. And in others still, Beelzebub has rebelled against Satan and taken control of hell for himself (Rudwin, *Pandemonium* 264). Medieval dramas evoke generic names that recall the devils' status before the fall; for example, the *York Corpus Christ Plays* (1460) uses

---

[6] Cynthis Baker's 2017 *Jew* argues that "Judeo-Christian" is an articficial construct meant to "Other" and marginalize Jewish identity. It also does not appear until 1899, marking the term's purpose for marginalizing Judaen culture and serving anti-semitic aims. Therefore, I do not use it here.

[7] For more on how visual difference functions rhetorically, see Alexander E. Makhov's 2011 "In Diversas Figuras Nequitiae: The Devil's Image from the Viewpoint of Rhetoric" in *Angels, Devils: The Supernatural and Its Visual Representation* and Umberto Eco's 2007 *On Ugliness.*

"Angelus Deficiens" [failing or disappointing angel]. In *The Castle of Perseverance* (1425), lesser named devils, such as Belial the Black. These names are often applied to minions and lesser demons as well. For purposes of this dissertation, I read all devil characters as versions of the same devil figure, taking my cue from Henry Ansgar Kelly, who notes that focusing on differences in names is potentially dangerous, since often the name given to the devil was merely the translator's preference (*Satan* 31). If a text provides a specific name, I utilize that; otherwise I prefer "devil" to reference the figure and his context.

The English devil most often functions as a *feindbild*, an artificially constructed common enemy that the people can align themselves against. *Feindbild's* etymology is Common Germanic, associated with the Old English word, feond, which means "enemy" and later becomes "fiend." It first appears in 975 C.E. in a Gospel of Matthew. Its second occurrence is in *Beowulf* (ca. 1000). In *Beowulf,* Grendel, a monstrous altern who lived in the borderlands of the fens, is described as a feond. Within the text, Grendel is an enemy because he invades Hrothgar's hall, which he sees as an invasion of his native lands. The word then has an inherent, understood, nationalistic meaning, with overtones of conquest and nativism. Later the word evolves to mean "the arch-enemy of mankind; the devil" (*OED*), with this use appearing around the same time as the text of *Beowulf*. The idea of "fiend" as a form of demon is seen in other Old English texts such as *Guthlac* (ca. 1000), religious sermons and homilies throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and in texts like *Genesis and Exodus* (1325), *Piers Plowman* (1393), *Cursor Mundi* (1400), and Geoffrey Chaucer's *Summoner's Prologue* (1386). In many of these texts, the term is used in a political context. *Guthlac* deals with a monk fighting demons who have been

displaced from their native land, also situated in the fens, by the construction of the monastery. The text centers around issues of divine right and conquest. *Genesis and Exodus* examines challenges to divine authority, while *Piers Plowman* examines the sins of man, redemption, and temptation, but must be read for the historical background of the Peasants Revolt of 1381. *Cursor Mundi* presents itself as a history of the world, as well as a guide and inspiration for life. The *Summoner's Prologue* describes a walk through hell, Satan, and where exactly friars go when dead. While not innately political, the satire of religious orders, their role in types of structures, and the hierarchy of hell, connects it to other texts that use "fiend" to identify an enemy to larger interests.

The devil's adversarial nature is present in both the common understanding of the figure and portrayals that do not conform to this understanding. The recognizable understanding of the devil that is seen from Old English texts such as *Christ and Satan, Genesis B,* and *Juliana,* is that of a dark, animalistic, unnatural figure. Later medieval texts such as *The Shewings of Julian Norwich* (1373), *The Castle of Perseverance* (1425), and dramas, also present this physical appearance. This visual rhetoric serves as a warning of what the devil is. While this portrayal waxes and wanes throughout the medieval and early modern period, it sees a resurgence in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century political pamphlets that demonize people and causes. Caricatured figures such as a large nose are added to this animal portrayal of both devils and Jews in *The Guthlac Roll* (1175-1215), *The Exchequer Roll: Norwich from 1233,* and in Caxton's illustrations of Satan and Job (1483-84). Jewish figures are also constructed as demonic through acts of sorcery, and conjuring demons such as seen in *Faust Book* (1587) and *Doctor Faustus* (1588). Women are associated with the devil as either saints to be admired or witches to

be defeated. Texts that feature hagiographies as models for women's lives include *Marian Lyrics* (12th c.), *The Legenda Aurea/The Golden Legend* (1260 Latin/1483 Caxton's English translation), the *Early South English Legendary* (1270-80), and Osbern Bokenham's *Legends of Holy Women* (1443). *The Book of Margery Kempe* (1430s) can also be read as providing a model for women. Early modern dramas such as *The Late Lancashire Witches* (1634) and *The Witch of Edmonton* (1621/1658) feature women who challenge the proper authority through witchcraft and devilish deals. In these popular portrayals and ones that focus on the devil's political nature and his nationalistic arguments, the devil is always the enemy of mankind, always trying to destroy what has been built and made, always seeking a power and position that is not his.

Past scholarship

Past scholarship on the devil falls into two categories, Biblically-based scholarship that evaluates portrayals of the character against his Biblical descriptions and historical surveys that trace the evolution of the devil figure. Henry Ansgar Kelly's 2006 *Satan: A Biography* is the most comprehensive text in the first category, providing a detailed look at every mention of devil figures in the Old and New Testaments. His work traces how these examples become the foundation for his understanding modern representations of temptation, possession, and the role and influence of Satan. Philip C. Almond's 2014 *The Devil: A New Biography* revisits the history of the devil, placing him against a Christian historical background covering much of the same ground as Kelly. In Western literature, the most popular representations of the devil merge disparate Biblical characterizations into a figure that served to unite Christians against a common enemy. Elaine Pagels' 1995 *The Origin of Satan: How Christians Demonized Jews, Pagans, and*

Heretics presents the devil as a stand-in or scapegoat for various threats and sinners. Darren Oldridge's 2012 *The Devil: A Very Short Introduction* does not provide any new information, but reorganizes it to focus on Western ideals of the devil, his role as adversary, and the varieties in presentation.

The historical survey of the devil figure is valuable for the breadth of the work which traces appearances and connections. The weakness of this approach is that it fails to analyze how the devil's purpose differs and adapts trans-historically in literature. Jeffrey Burton Russell's lifelong work on the history of the devil is by far the most comprehensive resource. His five-seminal works, *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition* (1981), *Lucifer: The Devil in the Middle Ages* (1984), *Mephistopheles: The Devil in the Modern World* (1986), and *Prince of Darkness: Radical Evil and the Power of Good in History* (1988) are still the foundation of devil studies. While Russell traces the devil from his first mosaic appearance to the modern day, he does not consider literary portrayals, instead focusing more on the overarching big picture. My work fills this gap in Russell's work. I began this research by replicating Russell's methodology, creating a survey of the devil in English literature from his first appearance to the Restoration. Once I did this, two main patterns emerged. The first was that most texts conformed to a common representation of the devil. The second, texts that do not conform to this representation are innately political and served as the vehicle for nationalistic arguments. Robert Muchembled's 2003 *A History of the Devil from the Middle Ages to the Present* covers much of the same historical material as Russell's work. Neil Forsyth's 2002 *The Satanic Epic* is not a historical text per se, instead tracing the probable sources Milton used in *Paradise Lost*. While a great resource for identifying and situating Milton's

references within *Paradise Lost*, Forsyth's work is very broad, looks at sources, but does not historicize the context of these sources.

Unfortunately, almost all of this scholarship[8] focuses on the history of the devil in his Western and Christian context.[9] Folklore studies identify some sources and analogues

---

[8] Other devil scholarship includes Philip C. Almond's 2004 *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England: Contemporary Texts and Their Cultural Contexts* and his 2011 *England's First Demonologist: Reginald Scot & 'The Discoverie of Witchcraft.'* Historically, Jews have a long history of being tied to the devil and scholarship reflects this from Jeffrey Jerome Cohen's 1999 *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity,* Joan Young Gregg's 1997 *Devils, Women, and Jews: Reflections of the Other in Medieval Sermon Stories,* and Joshua Trachtenberg's 1983 *The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and Its Relation to Modern Antisemitism.* For example, see Achsah Guibbory's 2010 *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England.* David Shyovitz's 2014 "Christians and Jews in the Twelfth-Century Werewolf Renaissance" connects Jews to larger historical narratives that connect the devil and monsters to Jews. David M. Goldberg's 2003 *The Curse of Ham: Race and Slavery in Early Judaism, Christianity and Islam* connects concepts of darkness with evil and the devil. Other works that connect portrayals of the devil to historically recognized elements of the devil include Saran Wall-Randell's 2008 "Doctor Faustus and the Printer's Devil."

[9] For example, see David Aers's 1975 *Piers Plowman and Christian Allegory,* Nienke Vos and Willemien Otten's 2011 *Demons and the Devil in Ancient and Medieval Christianity*. Old English scholarship reads the devil in many adversarial characters, for instance, R. M. Liuzza's 2002 "The Devil and His Father: A Case of Editorial Irresponsibility in the Old English Gospels?," Karen Louise Jolly's 1998 "Elves in the Psalms?: the Experience of Evil from a Cosmic Perspective," R. E. Woolf's 1953 "The Devil in Old English Poetry," Peter Dendle's 2001 *Satan Unbound: The Devil in Old English Narrative Literature* and the 2014 *Demon Possession in Anglo-Saxon England,* Lars Malmberg's 1977 "Grendel and the Devil," and David F. Johnson's 2006 "Hagiographical Demon or Liturgical Devil: Demonology and Baptismal Imagery in Cynewulf's Elene." Analyzing devils through their contrast to their previous angelic states is seen in Helmit Hundsbichler's 2011 "Devils in Visual Proximity," and Alexander Makhov's 2011 "In Diversas Figuras Nequitiae: The Devil's Image from the Viewpoint of Rhetoric" and "The Devil's Image from the Viewpoint of Rhetoric." Old English scholarship also connects Cain to the devil. For more on Anglo-Saxon scholarship on Cain, see David Williams's 1982 *Cain and Beowulf: A Study in Secular Allegory*, (1982); Ruth Mellinkoff's 1981"Cain's Monstrous Progeny in Beowulf: Part II: Post-Diluvian Survival" (1981); and Jennifer Neville's 2001 "Monsters and Criminals: Defining Humanity in Old English Poetry."

for specific literary devil figures,[10] but this work is rarely applied to literary studies, often only appearing in footnotes. There is no comprehensive study of the European/continental devil in literature that crosses periodization and discipline boundaries either.

This dissertation analyzes the ways in which various texts and genres—chronicle, song, drama, and epic—for how they imagine England and the devil's part in this imagination. Each of these works evokes and problematize common understandings of the English devil as a dark, animalistic figure who tempts, deceives, and seduces. These portrayals emphasize and use the political nature of the devil, including the dangers of devilish leaders, demonic parliaments, and diabolic rebellions to the English nation. William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum (Gesta)* (1125/1140), a historical chronicle written in Latin after the Norman Conquest, presents a unified vision of England and rewrites its history to show an unbroken national history, erasing any conflicts or tensions between the invading Normans and the native English. The common enemy constructed in the chronicle is not the Normans, but homegrown, devilish leaders who lead the nation astray and threaten England's stability. *A Song Called Þe Deulis Perlament, OR Parlamentum of Feendis* (1430) is considered a Middle English song, or poem, and a revision of the Harrowing of Hell genre. In most Harrowing of Hell

[10] Phyllis Siefker's 1997 *Santa Claus, Last of the Wild Men: The Origins and Evolution of Saint Nicholas, Spanning 50,000Years* connects the devil to Krampus folklore and Santa Claus. While not as common, the folkloric history of the devil is also seen in scholarship such as Judith Weil's 1998 "The White Devil and Old Wives' Tales." Barbara Traister's 2014 "Chapter 1: Magic and the Decline of Demons: A View from the Stage" reads devils through the context of witchcraft as does Michael David Bailey's 2003 *Battling Demons: Witchcraft, Heresy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages,* and Gary F. Jensen's 2007 *The Path of the Devil: Early Modern Witch Hunts*.

narratives Christ travels to Hell in the time between his Crucifixion and Resurrection to confront the devil and release worthy souls. These narratives emphasize the undeniable power and authority of Christ, his triumph over the devil, and his role as champion for the souls of mankind. *Þe Deulis Perlament* presents a dialogue between devils, meant to highlight the oral nature of Christ's teaching. I argue *ÞDP* demonstrates the inherent demonic threats these structures and the voice of the common people pose.

One of the main threats English devils pose is to structures of authority. They work to undermine the English monarchy by weakening its leaders, they challenge God and Christ's authority, and they openly rebel against the divine right of kings. Turning from the medieval to the early modern, political English devils move inward, threatening the power and stability of the monarchy through rebellion. The presentation of English devils also changes during this time from a visually different altern to human figures who act in devil-like fashion. On the surface, 1 *Henry IV* (1596-7/1598) and *Macbeth* (1606/1623) appear different in every way: one is a history and one is a tragedy; one was written at the end of Elizabeth I's rule, the other at the beginning of James I's reign. Neither features an easily recognizable devil. Yet both plays demonstrate early modern concerns over the threat rebellion posed to the power of the monarchy. Owain Glendower[11] in *1 Henry IV* and Macbeth are constructed as adversaries and devils, and therefore threats to England, because they are rebels and directly challenge the monarchy. *Paradise Lost* (1674) is an epic poem written in the English vernacular after the

---

[11] There is an understood connection between Owain Glendower and the devil. Marion Gibson and Jo Ann Esra refer to it in their 2014 *Shakespeare's Demonology: A Dictionary* and it is so commonly understood that on 19 April 2017, Jeopardy featured this question: "Owen Glendower bedeviled Henry IV on stage & in real life as a leader of rebel forces in this U.K. country" (https://j-archive.com/showgame.php?game_id=5615).

Restoration, showcasing each element of the political English devil. Satan is a devilish leader who is part of a demonic parliament, and a rebel who challenges the divine authority of God and the Son.

Defining England's Nationalism

There are three main scholarly approaches to nationalism: psychoanalytical, heritage based, and discursive. The psychoanalytical approach parallels Edward Said's 1978 *Orientalism* by creating external threats as projections of internal struggles, often racialized, sexualized, and fetishized. While this is partially visible in the way the Welsh, Scots, and Irish are marginalized in English literature, that is the common understanding of the devil, and this dissertation demonstrates the political argument these narratives make. Heritage-based nationalism is based on ethnicity, which presents similar challenges to this project as the psychoanalytical. This work does not restrict itself to the way a single ethnicity—the Welsh, or Scots, or Irish, or even native Britons—is constructed as demonic. Therefore, this approach plays in the background, but is not my main focus. As Krishan Kumar's approach below demonstrates, England's cultural history is inseparable from these other three nations, which makes psychoanalytical and heritage based approaches problematic.

Discursive construction combines several different contextual approaches, which closely aligns with my methodology. Rudolf De Cillia, Martin Reisigl, and Ruth Wodak outline five basic assumptions that present a clear outline for applying discursive construction in their 1999 article, "The Discursive Construction of National Identities":

> First, we start from the assumption that nations are to be understood as mental constructs, as 'imagined political communities'" (qtd. in Anderson,

> 1988:15). They are represented in the minds and memories of the nationalized subjects as sovereign and limited political units and can become very influential guiding ideas with sometimes tremendously serious and destructive consequences. (De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak 153)

One of the key arguments of this dissertation is that both the idea of nationalism and the political devil are artificial constructs.

> Second, we assume that national identities conceived as specific forms of social identities are discursively, by means of language and other semiotic systems, produced, reproduced, transformed and destructed. (De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak 153)

One of the elements that exhibits and performs the demonic nature of devil figures is their speech, the way their language, and the effect of this language, is constructed as demonic.

> Our third assumption draws on Pierre Bourdieu's notion of habitus. In our view, national identity can be regarded as a sort of habitus, that is to say as a complex of common ideas, concepts or perception schemes, (a) of related emotional attitudes intersubjectively shared within a specific group of persons; (b) as well as of similar behavioural dispositions; (c) all of which are internalized through 'national' socialization. (De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak 153)

In Chapters Two and Four devil figures are presented as a collective. Bourdieu's idea of habitus is also seen in Baudrillard's methodology of simulacra are also key to understanding the structures devils mimic to challenge authority.

> Fourth, the discursive construction of nations and national identities always runs hand in hand with the construction of difference/ distinctiveness and uniqueness (qtd. in Hall, 1994, 1996; Martin, 1995). (De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak 154)

The popular understanding of the devil is defined by difference, the ways the English delineate themselves from the demonic. This dissertation interrogates this idea by illustrating how human figures and their political structures are constructed as demonic to make nationalistic arguments. Finally,

> and this is the fifth assumption is that there is no such thing as the one and only national identity in an essentializing sense, but rather that different identities are discursively constructed according to context, that is according to the social field, the situational setting of the discursive act and the topic being discussed. (De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak 154)

As we will see, English nationalism is dynamic from the Anglo-Norman period to the Restoration; it shifts and adapts, as the devil figure does, to reflect the historical and cultural moment.

Krishan Kumar's 2003 *The Making of English National Identity* is a *longue duree* examination that applies a discursive approach. The complications of discussing English national identity begin with what term is used. I use English/England to refer to the political people and England for the nation-state throughout the dissertation. Britain could technically be used once Wales is incorporated into England until the Acts if Union 1535/1543, and many early modernists choose to use this term, but others argue that there is no Britain until Wales, Scotland, and Ireland are all incorporated in 1801. Both

"English" and "British" are used from the Anglo-Saxon period onwards (*OED).* My work focuses on the construction of English identity from 1125-1674, so I privilege "English" over "British." Kumar argues that "patriotic emotion" and nationalism is tied to the use of English over British (2) despite continuous moves throughout history to place England's past, and authority, with the Britons, a term first used by the Romans and later designating the Welsh.[12] Historical scholarship argues that referring to England erases the other/altern nations of Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, that contributed to British national identity. This erasure is not just a political move, but specifically one of conquest, ensuring that the political and national image presented is not just censored but an artificial construct, having erased the other, less desirable inhabitants from Britain's national narrative. Constructing the Welsh, Scots, and Irish as demonic "Others" reinforces English and British national identity and superiority. As a possible countermeasure, historians apply the 'four nations' approach that includes England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland and seeks to correct "Anglocentric accounts" and present a

[12] Britain and Britannia are first used by Greeks in the fourth century B.C.E. and refer to the people and the place. Angles and Saxons in the fifth century did not associate themselves with either term, but variations of the term "Briton" comes to be used to refer to the collective peoples of the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes (Kumar 9). However, the term continues to be applied throughout the Old English period, more as a historical term until the early modern period when it was adopted to signal England's more unified nature (Kumar 5). Employing the descriptor of Briton becomes part of claiming legitimacy for the monarchy, as seen with the legendary Arthur. For more on this, see I. J. Kirby's 1964 "Angles and Saxons in La(y)amon's *Brut*," Margaret Lamont's 2010 "Becoming English: Ronwenne's Wassail, Language, and National Identity in the Middle English Prose *Brut,*" Michael Faletra's 2002 "Once and Future Britons: The Welsh in Lawman's Brut," and Scott Kleinman's 2004 "The Æþelen of Engle: Constructing Ethnic and Regional Identities in Laȝamon's Brut." For Wales's importance in defining England's history, see Ralph A. Griffith**s'** 2011 *Wales and the Welsh in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to J. Beverly Smith*, and Max Lieberman's 2010 *The Medieval March of Wales: The Creation and Perception of a Frontier, 1066–1283*.

more comprehensive history (Kumar 4). This approach demonstrates the ways in which English national identity is not so much "the story of the evolution and expansion of one nation" as, rather, the history of 'three kingdoms' (English, Scottish, and Irish) or 'four nations' (English, Welsh, Scottish, Irish), all interacting with one another in complex ways" (Kumar 14). I argue that despite constructing these alterns as demonic English literature focuses on English, not British, nationalism.

The political devil appears as a tool to define English nationalism as England begins to operate as a cohesive nation. Some historians place the origin of this nation in the eighth century, but certainly there is "No doubt England by the eleventh century had become one of the most, if not the most, integrated and centralized states in Europe, an achievement usually credited in the main to Alfred the Great" (Kumar 42). Kumar places this origin after the Norman Conquest in 1066: "William's kingdom, it is clear, was an English kingdom, and William—among other things—an English king" (Kumar 49). Certainly, Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum* presents England as a unified country and concept. By erasing the tribal elements of England—the Angles, Danes, Jutes, and Saxons that represented the more undesirable aspects of the population—a different, artificially constructed narrative of the English nation emerges. Writers such as Malmesbury contribute to an ideal of England simply by writing it as an ideal. In these narratives, England becomes England because it is written that way, and this imagined England has no place for ethnic or tribal elements. Instead, these elements are relegated to the fringes, subsumed into larger narratives, or erased entirely.

Methodology and Scope

To identify how the political English devil challenges common understandings and to demonstrate the nationalistic work these portrayals accomplish, I read these texts through a New Historicist lens, relying heavily on historical scholarship that defines and traces English national identity. I apply a folkloristic methodology by analyzing how the devil is the vehicle for anxieties, concerns, fears, and desires of a historical and cultural moment. This cross-discipline, trans-historical, historicist approach reveals the important role of the neglected figure of the political devil in constructing English national identity. This dissertation begins with an Anglo-Norman chronicle and ends with a post-Restoration epic, including texts from the medieval and the early modern period. This long view allows me to identify patterns associated with the figure of the devil and how he was used to comment on politics and define national identity, patterns that have previously gone unrecognized because of restrictions to periodization and discipline. My work historicizes these texts, allowing me to exhibit how devil figures represent political anxieties as they shift and adapt to reflect changing historical and cultural moments. Even where the devil figure is not a work's primary focus, he is always instrumental in defining Englishness.

Devil figures reveal how national identity is artificially constructed. These texts represent multiple genres and time periods, highlighting the ways these issues cross boundaries. The political devil as artificial construct is an enemy, adversary, rebel, who leads other astray through demonic speech, traits that pose a threat to the nation. While this devil figure adapts and changes across this *longue duree* (1125-1674) to suit different needs and reflect different fears, he is consistently employed to represent, by opposition,

English nationalistic interests. Taking this methodological approach identifies several key topoi of the Judeo-Christian devil such as fictional foundations, devilish leaders, infernal councils, and rebellion. I apply these topoi to the political English devil tradition and demonstrate how these topoi construct devils as adversaries to the English nation and monarchy, defining national identity against devilish leaders, demonic political structures, and rebellion. The devil figures in *Gesta regum Anglorum, A Song Called Þe Deulis Perlament, OR Parlamentum of Feendis*, *1 Henry IV*, *Macbeth* and *Paradise Lost* challenge and complicate the normal presentation of the devil and perform specific, political work in doing so.

The devil's political and secular nature, his role in defining a nation, specifically the English nation, has not received much attention. Each dissertation chapter asks how the chosen texts imagine the political community of England by using the devil as a point of contrast.[13] Jean Baudrillard's 1981 *Simulacra and Simulation* and Mikhail Bakhtin's 1984 *Rabelais and His World* are key for unpacking how demonic characters follow the forms of carnival and mimicry, appearing to wrest control and pervert norms but ultimately only reinforcing the initial power structures. Art and literature imagine a nation, which then becomes a model for real life.

The idea that England is a mythical or invented nation is not a new concept. It is a popular concept in Arthurian legends, where England's past is rewritten to claim legitimacy through the classical connections to Brutus. These legends erase the other

---

[13] This is where I apply Benedict Anderson's theory of imagined communities. Anderson's work is modernist and focuses on specifically European and Asian connections in the early 1980s, and modern, populist genres such as newspapers, but as I have mentioned is often applied anachronistically to discussions of nationalism.

ethnic groups that are not part of this new England, and rewrite England's history as a homogeneous, continuous history.[14] Benedict Anderson's 1983 *Imagined Communities* was my foundational text for analyzing how the devil is enlisted to make nationalistic arguments in English literature. Anderson argues that "Nations, however, have no clearly identifiable births, and their deaths, if they ever happen, are never natural" (205). Yet literature so often does provide the birth, the origin of a nation, whether it is the folklore and legends of Arthur claiming legitimacy through Brutus or historical chronicles like *Gesta regum Anglorum* that write a fictional foundation that becomes the blueprint for making a nation.

Chapter One, "Imagining England through Devilish Leaders and Inspirational Role Models in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum* (1125/1140)," argues that *Gesta* imagines England as a unified state with strong leadership that serves as a role model for others. Here the devil marks various leaders as devilish, which in turn identifies them as a threat to the nation-state and the people. In *Gesta regum Anglorum,* Malmesbury creates a unified England that does not exist by rewriting English history as a continuous, unbroken narrative. He defines Englishness against devilish leaders who threaten the stability of the nation from within and through role models of good leadership that current and future leaders can look to for inspiration. It is worth noting that while Chapter One focuses on threats to the nation, as does Chapter Four, Chapters Two and Three construct the demonic as the people and structures who counter the power structure and authority of the monarchy, not the collective of the people.

---

[14] *The Story of England* by Robert Manning of Brunne (ca. 1338) functions in a similar manner, evoking Arthur then erasing his problematic, native, status.

Chapter Two, "The Democratic Collective as Demonic in *A Song Called, OR Parlamentum of Feendis*" (1430), demonstrates how the text imagines England as threatened by the relatively new political structure of Parliament. Here the demonic is the collective, democratic nature of Parliament and the threat it presents to natural authority and a strong king (Jesus). Key to the argument presented in Chapter Two is the presentation of a demonic utopia, the inverse of heaven, Baudrillard's simulacrum. Per Anderson, utopias are not meant to be read as "lost Edens" but serve as commentaries on "contemporary societies" (69). Thus, the demonic parliament in *Þe Deulis Perlament* stands in for political anxieties elicited by the creation of the first English Parliament. The devils' voices are the voices of the collective and the vehicle for the fear that a democratic collective might endanger the nation. Various figures in *Gesta*, Christ in Chapter Two, Prince Hal and Macduff in Chapter Three, and God and the Son in Chapter Four are all role models who face off against these devil figures. These role models provide the blueprint for how order and authority can be restored. In *Þe Deulis Perlament*, the democratic, collective parliament is constructed as demonic rather than a single, individual devil. I apply Jean Baudrillard's *Simulacra and Simulation* to demonstrate how the demonic parliament formed in *Þe Deulis Perlament* is mimesis and not true creation, a simulacrum of the heavenly council and power structures it imitates. By employing Mikhail Bakhtin's work on carnival to analyze the behavior of devils in these texts, we can see how the devils misread their imitative councils as real, and the actions of the devils only end up reinforcing initial power structures. Within *Þe Deulis Perlament*, the political structure of Parliament manifests as demonic because it grants equal weight to all voices and because it is not real. The Parliament that the devils form

emphasizes the artificial nature of the community the demonic collective has formed. In *Þe Deulis Perlament*, the demon collective is a "symbolic construct" (Loewenstein and Stevens 175), not a newly created community in hell but rather an imitation of the structures they knew before the fall. As in *Gesta regum Anglorum,* the purpose of the text is instructional. The audience is meant to learn what the devils cannot, that only God can create, that any intent to mimic heavenly creation is doomed to fail, and that certain structures are inherently demonic and must be carefully dealt with.

In the early modern period, the imagined nation seen in Shakespeare's plays focuses not on an ethnically, visually different altern devil but internal rebellions in the form of an English noble, Hotspur, who rebels against his rightful king, and the Scottish rebel Macbeth. The imagined England as seen in Shakespeare's plays in Chapter Three, "Diabolical Rebellions in *1Henry IV* and *Macbeth*" is a fractured one, threatened by internal threats and rebellion. The imagined communities in both plays are haunted by the danger of internal rebellion whether it comes in the form of a noble like Hotspur who feels betrayed by an unfit king, or a once-loyal soldier who lets his ambition blind him to betrayal. Chapter Three depicts the danger promised in Chapters One and Two, that devilish leaders will use their demonic speech to incite rebellion, threatening the people and stability of the monarchy and therefore the nation. Chapter Three builds on the lessons of Chapters One and Two, shifting the threat to English national identity to the internal rebellions of Hotspur and Macbeth. These rebellions are not against God, but against his divinely appointed kings, motivated by personal reasons that become national ones. Chapter Three also presents a shift from national authority to a monarchial one. As we will see in Chapter Four, this focus on the monarchy and not the nation continues.

In Chapter Four, "*Paradise Lost's* Reformed Devil," I demonstrate how *Paradise Lost* imagines England where political structures as fallible and demonic, and faith in God is the only answer, couched in the classical form of the epic. Anderson argues that the epic genre creates a distinctive form of community, and that it is not a coincidence that national anthems or epics present a specific narrative about communities (145). Epics are inseparable from their nations, the communities they represent, and their births and origins. Chapter Four addresses each of the previously explored topics: devilish leadership, demonic parliaments, and diabolical rebels. In this chapter I identify each of these elements in the second, twelve-book version of *Paradise Lost* (1674), explore the effect of these topics on the epic, and demonstrate the nationalistic arguments Satan makes and how Milton consciously constructs the imagined community of England after the Restoration of 1660. If epics write the births of nations, *Paradise Lost* illustrates how epics can be revised to write the deaths and rebirths of nations. In *Paradise Lost*, Satan is a devilish leader who contaminates other angels with his heretical ideals, leading to rebellion and the fall. The fallen angels attempt to recreate the very structures they rebelled against, forming a "symbolic construct" (Loewenstein and Stevens 175) in hell that is the simulacrum, not the real of heaven. They see these creations as triumphs over the Father and Son, but as Chapter Two illustrates, their behavior only reinforces the righteousness of God. The end of the epic reasserts the natural order, that God and the Son are the only true leaders capable of creation and thus have authority over the fallen angels and mankind. This also provides the mechanism for restoring order, not secular leaders and role models as we see in Chapters One and Three, but spiritual ones.

In English literature light and darkness, good and evil, God and the Devil, are often presented as clear binaries. The devil's physical darkness and his unnatural animal appearance are understood as the physical manifestation of his sin, a visual difference that signifies his danger to others. The devil is often placed in wild and border spaces, the unknown. He must be opposed, fought, conquered. Satan is a liminal figure, moving easily between worlds. In literature, the devil and his minions, move from hell to earth and back again. Their liminal status is key to their main mission—to tempt mankind away from God and cause their fall. The political English devil seen in these texts present a different portrayal from the common understanding of the devil to make specific statements about what it means to be English in England from the Norman Conquest to the Restoration. The devil marks who the true threats to the nation-state are, and how good, Christian English men and women, and their country, can defeat him, and ensure the success of England.

My *longue duree* approach proves through an analysis of the role of the devil that English "Nationalism has undergone a process of modulation and adaptation according to different eras, political regimes, economies and social structures" (Anderson 157). This analysis reveals that the English devil is innately political, dynamic, speaks across genres, time periods, and social class, reflecting specific nationalistic concerns. Using his methodological model future scholarship can reconsider how the devil works in other texts as the vehicle for concerns about economics, personal identity, and globalization. In future projects, I hope to continue this approach of focusing on a single folkloric figure over a *longue duree* and crossing periodization. This approach allows us to understand *Paradise Lost* in a more complete context which is key as the mythology presented in the

epic becomes the foundation for the common understanding of who the devil is, the war in heaven, and the construction of hell, which I plan on exploring in my next long-term project.

Chapter One: Devilish Leaders and Inspirational Role Models in the Imagined England of William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum*

In *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson defines a nation as "an imagined political community imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign" and states that a nation "is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (Anderson 6-7). Nationalism is always an artificial construct, more so when presented through literature. Literature creates an image, presents it to the world, which in turn accepts that narrative as representing a whole, whether that is a person, idea or nation. Legends and myths often present heroes and nations as role models, figures to emulate, ideas to aspire to. These portrayals have certain aims—to gather support for a cause, choose sides, or reinforce authority and power structures. The nationalistic work of legends and epics has long been generally accepted, chronicles and other genres of literature less so. In his chronicle, *Gesta regum Anglorum* (1125/1140), William of Malmesbury constructs an imagined England after the Norman Conquest. His artificial construction of England and its kings, creates roles models and national identity through language, simply by writing it so. Malmesbury's presentation of nation only exists in "the minds and memories of the nationalized subjects," formed through language, shared through publication "within a specific group of persons" (De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak 153), with their own national identity defined against "difference/distinctiveness" of others (De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak 154). He presents a paradoxical vision of England, a nation that is cohesive and successful but also

a nation that is a bit lost, lacking clear, strong leadership. *Gesta* seeks to provide a guidebook to England's leaders to ensure its success.

Malmesbury constructs the England he wants to see by presenting a series of lessons to current and future kings of England like the Mirror of Princes genre[15] through *Gesta*, a historical chronicle that covers seven hundred years, from the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons to Henry I, the current king at Malmesbury's writing. Much like St. Augustine's *The City of God* (5th c.) and St. Gregory I's *Pastoral Care* (6th c.), *Gesta* seeks to provide both deplorable and emulatable examples as part of these lessons. Other early medieval texts present themselves as chronicles and make nationalistic statements;[16] yet Malmesbury's work is the only one that invokes the devil to make these statements, and scholarship has failed to consider the political role the devil plays within this text. Malmesbury's work is unique because he consciously imagines England as a specific political construct. In *Gesta*, the devil highlights the fact that the true threat to the nation of England is devilish leadership, as evidenced by the sinful acts of Ceolred, the canons that seek to malign Alfred, the dukes, bishops, and abbats[17] whose actions cause the Norman Conquest, and the tainted rule of William II. Devilish leadership can be secular

[15] The Mirror of Princes genre was seen in the early Middle Ages, continued throughout the medieval and into the early modern period.

[16] For example, see Michael Faletra's 2000 "Narrating the Matter of Britain: Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Norman Colonization of Wales," Rodney Thomson's 1996 "William of Malmesbury's Carolingian Sources," Sean McGlynn's 1996 "British Nationalism and Europe: A Medieval Comparison," and D. R. Howlett's 1995 "The Literary Context of Geoffrey of Monmouth: An Essay on the Fabrication of Sources." Other scholarship focuses on Malmesbury himself such as Rodney Thomson's 1987 *William of Malmesbury,* Kirsten Fenton's 2008 *Gender, Nation and Conquest in the Works of William of Malmesbury,* and Monika Otter's 1996 *Inventiones: Fiction and Referentiality in Twelfth-Century English Historical Writing*.

[17] This is how it is spelled in Giles's translation from "abbates" in the Latin.

or religious, but it is always a threat to the nation, and always has a political role. Within the text, each of these types of demonic leadership threatens the stability, success, and future of England. In addition to devilish leaders who consciously choose to spread evil, to infect the political constructs that make up England, there are also weak men who are bedeviled, and in their weakness, weaken England. As a counter to these threats, the chronicle highlights the importance of good kings to England's success. *Gesta* presents role models of goodness that serve as adversaries to devilish leaders. Alfred is presented as one such role model, as are Edward and Offa.

Imagined England

Specific authors, like William of Malmesbury and later John Milton, consciously construct these artefacts in the form of chronicles and epics to present specific nationalistic rhetorics. Benedict Anderson says that "nation-ness, as well as nationalism, are cultural artefacts of a particular kind" (4) yet he does not address the purposeful, and artificial, construction of these cultural artefacts, these literary creations. *Gesta regum Anglorum* opens with an Author's Epistle from William of Malmesbury to Robert, Earl of Gloucester, the eldest, illegitimate son of King Henry I (reigns from 1100-1135), half-brother to Empress Matilda and her military advisor during England's Civil War with Normandy (1135-1153), called The Anarchy. Malmesbury's dedication emphasizes "the dangers" Robert faces "to secure our tranquility" (Malmesbury 1).[18] From the beginning Malmesbury boldly states what is at stake with how he envisions England, and his chronicle. He dedicates the project "especially" to Robert (1) because Malmesbury

[18] I use J. A. Giles's English translation; however, for my analysis, my emphasis is on Malmesbury's conscious construction of the demonic for political and nationalistic purposes, so I privilege his name in the citation, not the translators.

states), whom he considers a role model for future leaders of England. Robert possesses goodness and traits such as "magnanimity" and," "munificence," and "circumspection" (2), which he has inherited from his grandfather, father, and uncle. Malmesbury consciously presents his work in the genre of Mirror of Princes, stating that his work is one "in which you [Robert] may contemplate yourself as in a glass, where your Highness's sagacity will discover that you have imitated the actions of the most exalted characters" (2). Malmesbury imagines England as a hereditary kingdom where the traits of excellent leadership can be inherited, regardless of whether or not the heir is legitimate. His chronicle imagines England as a political construct in which leaders who do England a disservice are devilish, closely aligned with weak men who are bedeviled by poor advisors, both who threaten the stability of the nation and can only be defeated by inspirational leaders, the only ones capable of upholding England's political structure. Malmesbury imagines this England by writing it as a strong, epic, classically founded nation. He also imagines an England where he, as an Anglo-Norman, has a place.

One of Malmesbury's guiding ideas in *Gesta* is unity— a unified England with no separate factions, a unified literary structure, and this unity is dependent on England's leaders. William of Malmesbury's parents were English and Norman, and he was placed in a monastery when he was just a boy. He writes *Gesta regum Anglorum* in 1125, revises it in 1127, and adds his *Historia Novella* to it in 1142, reflecting King Stephen's reign (Malmesbury vii). While his chronicles are his best-known works, he also wrote about the lives of St. Aldhelm, St. Dunstan, St. Patrick, St. Benignus, St. Elfgifa, and St. Indract as well as Wulstan and the Blessed Virgin. His concerns in *Gesta* focus on relating the "virtues and vices" (x) of the leaders of England, and presents England's history as

legendary, continuous, and unbroken, stretching back to classical times. The political examples Malmesbury describes knit together all of English history and provide a manual for successful leadership. In his preface Malmesbury states his inspiration for writing was "love to my country" (2), emphasizing the intended nationalistic purpose of the chronicle. The project is imaged as a political one from the beginning, something that Malmesbury reinforces in his prefaces to each book. *Gesta* is divided into five books; the first book details the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons, the second leads up to the Norman Conquest, and the three remaining books cover William the Conqueror and his sons. The later *Historia Novella* covers Stephen's reign (1135-1154). *Gesta* presents seven hundred years of fractured, paradoxical narratives as a single, woven history to instruct current and future rulers on their place in English history.

One of the ways Malmesbury constructs his unified England is by writing it as truth, constructing the "specific social identities" (De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak 153) he wants to see. *Gesta regum Anglorum's* reframing of history as an inspirational narrative featuring near legendary figures is not unfamiliar to readers. Arthurian legends in English literature function similarly. Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* (731),[19]

---

[19] Past scholarship on Bede's work has focused on the materiality of the text, the manuscript itself, what the text reveals about the historical and cultural moment such as Alaric Hall, and Matti Kilpiö's 2010 *Interfaces between Language and Culture in Medieval England: A Festschrift for Matti* Kilpiö. Sources for Bede's work such as Sharon M. Rowley's 2003 "Reassessing Exegetical Interpretations of Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum," Samuel Cardwell's 2015 "'The People Whom He Foreknew': The English As a Chosen People in Bede's 'Historia Ecclesiastica'" makes nationalistic arguments that the Anglo-Saxons were the chosen people as presented by Bede as does Stephen J. Harris 2001 "Bede and Gregory's Allusive Angles," Mehan and Townsend's 2001 "'Nation' and the Gaze of the Other in Eighth-Century Northumbria" and James Merriman's 1973 *The Flower of Kings: A Study of the Arthurian Legend in England Between 1485 and 1835.* Other work focuses on the historical accuracy and

Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* (1136),[20] and the *Alliterative Morte Arthure* (1400) all present their narratives as epic versions of England's history and make nationalistic arguments, yet none use the devil to do it. *Historia Regum Britanniae* (1136), and the *Alliterative Morte* imagine a more secular model, while Bede imagines England as a thriving, pious, Christian nation. These texts revise Welsh and French tales to claim classical foundations for England and present kingship as an unbroken line originating with Brutus. Heroes, villains, love, and magic are key to these nationalistic narratives. In Arthurian tales, King Arthur is a hero, divinely inspired, aided by the devil's son, Merlin. The power of a righteous England is so strong that the son of the devil himself, Merlin, rejects evil to serve God and his chosen king, Arthur, yet this is as close as these texts get to using the devil. In Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*, Merlin's father is not named as a devil; his mother simply states, "there appeared to me a person in the shape of a most beautiful young man"[21] (Rollins CHAP.

---

references of Bede's work such as Nicholas Evans' 2008 "The Calculation of Columba's Arrival in Britain in Bede's Ecclesiastical History and the Pictish King-Lists." In addition to examining Bede's text for its historical context, other scholars have examined the style and patterns within the work such as Günter Kotzor's 1985 "Anglo-Saxon Martyrologists at Work: Narrative Pattern and Prose Style in Bede and the Old English Martyrology*"*and Manish Sharma's 2014 "Beyond Nostalgia: Formula and Novelty in Old English Literature."

[20] Scholarship on Geoffrey's work, similarly to Bede, often focuses on the text, translations, and early vernacular versions. The majority of the rest of the scholarship concentrates on the Geoffrey's work as part of the Arthurian narrative tradition. Out of these works, quite a few focus on Merlin but not as a demonic figure not through an explicitly political lens.

[21] The Latin reads, "Unum autem scio, quia cum essem in thalamo parentum puella, apparuit mihi quidam in specie formosi iuvenis, ut videbatur, et amplectens me strictis bracchiis saepissime osculabatur et statim evanescebat, ita ut indicium hominis non appareret loquebaturque aliquando non comparens." Yet Geoffrey does insert the devil into other sections of his texts signaling that this is conscious choice to omit him here. He says the devil entered Vortigern's heart, "the devil took this opportunity to enter into his

XVIII). Shapeshifting is a known demonic trait and later Merlin narratives such as *Robert the Devil* (13th century.)*,* the *Prose Merlin* (1450)*, Sir Gowther* (1475),[22] Heywood's *Life of Merlin* (1641), and Rowley's *The Birth of Merlin* (1662) specifically name Merlin's father as demonic. This characterization is read back onto Geoffrey. These texts, from Bede to early modern Merlin narratives, make nationalistic statements about what defines England, but scholarship has so far neglected to consider the role of the political devil in these fictional narratives of England's founding.[23] In part, this oversight may be attributed to the Welsh and French origins of these Arthurian texts, which do not feature the devil. With a kingly lineage that traces back to Brutus and origins of Briton itself, Arthur legitimizes England as a nation and creates a narrative that ignores England's problematic and fractured past. Arthurian legends supply a cautionary tale when devilish leaders such as Vortigern and Mordred threaten hereditary kingship and national unity. These tales also intertwine nostalgia with nationalism, highlighting how a yearning for a nation of old is key to the success of the current nation state. *Gesta regum Anglorum* tells

---

heart, and to make him in love with the damsel, so that he became suitor to her father for her. It was, I say, by the devil's entering into his heart, that he, who was a Christian, should fall in love with a pagan" (Chapter XII). The devil also targets Vortimer, "But his goodness quickly stirred up the enmity of the devil against him" (Chapter XIV).

[22] Scholarship on *Sir Gowther* often focuses on the conversion or romance aspect such as Joanne A. Charbonneau's 2002 "From Devil to Saint: Transformations in Sir Gowther" and Dorothy McCoy's 1978 "From Celibacy to Sexuality: An Examination of Some Medieval and Early Renaissance Versions of the Story of Robert the Devil."

[23] Elizabeth Skylar's 2003 work "Ælfric's Life of Saint Edmund: Constructing National Identity" looks at Anglo-Saxon constructions of national identity, countering arguments that England did not function as a nation at this time. John Gillingham's 2000 *The English in the Twelfth Century: Imperialism, National Identity, and Political Values* makes similar arguments as does Krishan Kumar's 2003 *The Making of English National Identity*.

the fictional founding of England, and features framed narratives of the devil that highlight the dangerous and consequences of devilish leaders at home.

Early medieval English chronicles present themselves as true and accurate, as history, but they are fictional accounts of England, depicting the foundation of the nation as an unbroken line from the heroes of Troy to Arthur. These fictional accounts seek to justify England's presence on a world stage and legitimize England's history and leadership. Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* (ca. 731) does this for the Anglo-Saxon period and William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum* (1125) does this for England after the Norman Conquest, but only Malmesbury invokes the political devil to do it. *Gesta* creates a specific fiction of England after the Conquest, writing both the death and birth of a nation. Malmesbury presents the death of England as it existed before the Norman Conquest as well as the birth of England after the Norman Conquest by inventing a continuity of kingship and nation that did not exist. He does this first through the choice of the genre of a chronicle, which he specifically identifies as inspired by and building on the work of Bede (Malmesbury 3). *Gesta* defines England as a nation from the arrival of the Angles in 449 (Malmesbury 5) up to his present day. It describes England as always being England and argues that despite facing numerous and varied threats England has always been a unified nation. Anglo-Norman writers attempted to (re)create a perceived unity that existed in England before the Norman Conquest where "the common people of England united against the oppressions of their foreign rules, the Normans" (Kumar 48). William of Malmesbury[24] writes roughly two generations after the Norman Conquest,

[24] There is almost no literary scholarship on William of Malmesbury's work. The majority of the scholarship considers it as a chronicle, compares it to other chronicles,

long enough for the English to realize that the Normans were not a temporary occupation but permanent rulers. One way Anglo-Norman writers (re)created this unity was in their presentations of England. *Gesta's* single narrative of English history makes no distinction in England before and after the Norman Conquest. Within the text, Malmesbury uses Angles and England to refer to the nation's inhabitants, and describes Mercian kings as English kings. This fashions "a sense of identity" (Treharne 123) that is inclusive, constructing everyone as English. While Malmesbury's England is a unified nation currently under great leadership in the form of Henry I (1068-1135), he argues there are still lessons to be learned through a detailed examination of England's history and past leadership. The history presented in *Gesta* is focused inward, concerned with the internal role models and threats England faces. Within the text, the threats to England are not external, visually different alterns, but evil and corrupt leaders within England. *Gesta* describes an English nation that does not yet exist at the time of his writing, one that is unified and strong. Malmesbury's fictional account of England's founding defines nationalism, unity, and emulatable leadership in contrast to a fractured, and divided England, under questionable devilish leadership.

Gesta regum Anglorum's chronicle starts in 449 when "Angles and Saxons first came into Britain" (5) and from the beginning focuses on leaders who are a threat to England. Vortigern and his evil actions begin England's history, followed by Ambrosius, named "sole survivor of the Romans, who became monarch after Vortigern" (11). The legendary King Arthur is relegated to less than a paragraph, described as the "warlike

---

and examines the historical accuracy of the text, or the ways in which it was accepted as history, all under historical headings.

Arthur" who is the same figure "that the Britons so fondly tell so many fables" (11). Malmesbury uses Arthur to set the classical foundation of England but then dismisses the Britons, the natives, as a whole. While he describes Arthur as someone who "long upheld the sinking state, and roused the broken spirit of his countrymen to war," he also states that after a siege, the Britons were defeated and scattered and then "basely murdered to a man" by Hengist (12). It is impossible to discount Arthur, but real kings cannot emulate legends, so Malmesbury deals with him in the most expeditious way possible. For Malmesbury, Hengist is the focus here, as his son Eisc becomes king of all Kent (12). These kings, followed by Ethelbert who "subjugated every kingdom of the Angles, with the exception of the Northumbrians" (12), joined with France, and was advised by Augustine, defining England's foundation as a Christian political state and hereditary kingdom. Malmesbury evokes Arthur's name and native status only to discard it and move onto who he sees as the true kings of England.

Malmesbury acknowledges England's legendary background with Arthur and later Woden but he emphasizes that the fate of England depends on its real kings. As the chronicle moves forward power shifts from the West Saxons and Cerdic (495 C.E.), who claims to be descended from Woden[25] to Hengist to present Northumbria's rise to power (45 C.E.). Counting from Hengist's reign, Penda, "tenth in descent of Woden" becomes king of the Mercians in 626. Malmesbury begins chapter five, about the Kings of the East Angles by explaining that all the other kingdoms have been a preface to this history. The section then moves onto the East Saxons. While Malmesbury presents England's history

[25] This claim to Norse and Germanic mythology is also interesting given the similarities between the appearance of Krampus as a dark, animalistic, creature of hell, who doles out punishment, and the common understanding of the English devil.

as a cohesive narrative, paradoxical sections like this are problematic. He simply ignores or skips over the elements that do not fit his narrative.

In addition to being grounded in legend, Malmesbury's imagined England is an educated one. Book II begins with Malmesbury's personal experiences with books, literature, medicine, and history, to establish what is at stake for the people of the English nation, emphasizing the idea that England's success depends on all these things. Beginning with King Egbert (800-833) Book III begins with King Egbert (800-833) and ends with William the Conqueror's rule 1066-1087 (Malmesbury 258). Book IV reaffirms the purpose of Malmesbury's Author Epistle, presents the importance of his research, and frames his advice and his truth as a gift to leaders (326). This book also starts during what would have been Malmesbury's "modern era" with William the Second (1087-1100). Book V begins with the "current" reign of Henry I (1100-1129) and focuses on his piety as well as his great leadership. The book concludes in "the twentieth year" of Henry's reign but Malmesbury stresses Robert's role not Henry's. He repeats his reasons for dedicating the volume to Robert, his nobility, military science, learning, justice, and munificence. For Malmesbury these traits and Robert are the culmination of the combined Norman, Flemish, and French heritage seen in *Gesta.*

Gesta regum Anglorum intertwines the separate voices and stories of the Angles, Saxons, Mercians, and Northumbrians and designates them all as English, together telling the story of England. Malmesbury writes this fictional founding by acknowledging these differences and then ignoring them. For Malmesbury devilish leaders threaten the national project he imagines by leading the nation astray and breaking down the political systems that ensure England's success and serve its people. If a king or advisor is

deceived by the devil, gives into temptations or sins of the flesh, then this rot spreads throughout the kingdom. First the advisors, then the councils, other lords, and finally down to the people. The nation collapses from within. For Malmesbury what is at stake in *Gesta* is not just a chronicle of English history but the fate of England itself.

Devilish Leadership

William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum* identifies devilish leaders, both secular and religious, are shown as the biggest threats to England's unity and success. Devilish leaders threaten England because their immorality can infect the nation. Ceolred is a devilish secular leader because he is an immoral king, a debaucher of nuns (Malmesbury 75). Later, the canons are constructed as devilish leaders because they try to erase Alfred's legacy by besmirching his character (Malmesbury 122). Malmesbury states that the Norman Conquest was punishment for the behavior of devilish secular and religious leaders such as the "dukes, bishops, and abbats" who "are not the ministers of God, but of the devil" (Malmesbury 252). William II, son and heir to William the Conqueror, a great warrior and man, cannot overcome the consequences of his own devilish behavior. He is an English king yet he is also Norman, illustrating how paradox defines English nationalism. Malmesbury sidesteps the issue of how Normans are good English kings and instead focuses on the exemplary leadership skills, and how good leadership is hereditary. He is the son of a great king yet he is bedeviled by weakness. As Malmesbury describes it, England is cursed for a year and a day because of devilish leadership. In each of these instances, the devils who threaten England are the men who act against England's interests and are therefore devilishly. In this way, Malmesbury's portrayals foreshadow the early modern ones where the biggest devilish threats are

humans who act as devils. In *Gesta regum Anglorum*, the devil marks devilish leaders who are threats, and the inspirational leaders who oppose them.

Björn Weiler's work focuses on Malmesbury's role models, how good kings are measured for "maintaining the peace; defending the realm; practicing piety, founding, endowing or re-establishing monastic houses, ensuring that not a whiff of simony poisoned the English church; and upholding justice" (Weiler 7). Conversely, he argues bad kings as people who "acted in a manner that, according to Malmesbury, was contrary to nature, immoral and depraved" (Weiler 8). While the devil is often described as unnatural, strangely absent from his analysis are the leaders that *Gesta* constructs as demonic and how these figures are innately political. Weiler focuses on "the *rex inutilis,* the useless king," (Weiler 11) such as "William Rufus, Robert Curthose, Harold Godwinson and Stephen of Blois," (Weiler 14) but ignores demonic ones. I build on Weiler's work on the useless king to analyze the nationalistic project of Malmesbury's characterization of devilish leaders and address this gap. Both useless kings and devilish leaders are identified by their vices, and infect their subjects and the land at large, leading to "penury, foreign invasions and civil unrest" (Weiler 12). Weiler's work on useless kings aligns with my reading of bedeviled and weak kings who could "atone for their misdeeds" (17) if they choose the correct advisers (18). Malmesbury attempts to shape England's future by rewriting its history and actively influence England's future leaders like Robert. *Gesta regum Anglorum* is written with a clear focus, meant to function as books of old that "were written for kings or queens in order to provide them with a sort of pattern for their own lives, from which they could learn to follow some men's successes,

while avoiding the misfortunes of others" (Weiler 4).[26] Just as hagiographies as a genre highlight lessons for laypeople *Gesta* shows England's past devilish nobles and leaders as lessons to current and future leaders.

Malmesbury's devilish figures are varied in what constructs them as demonic but what connects them is their adversarial nature. The devils are the vehicles for the lessons in leadership. This can be seen in the variety of terms Malmesbury uses to describe the devils, as seen in the chart below. He does not privilege vernacular or ecclesiastical Latin terms, using them interchangeably. As they all serve the same didactic purpose I feel comfortable referring to all instances as "devil." I also believe that his interchangeable use indicates a common understanding of these terms.

Figure	Term
Ceolred 709-716	"Spiritus malignus," [malignant spirits'][27] and "diabolo" [devil] to describe the devil figures associated with Ceolred (Malmesbury 114).
Offa 757-796	"Diabolico fomento inflammante" [ground of difference fomented by the

[26] Similar to Weiler, I am uninterested in the historical accuracy of Malmesbury's chronicle, "Whether his portrayal of individual rulers was accurate or not is irrelevant for the particular questions this article strives to answer. Like any historian of the twelfth century, Malmesbury filtered the events he recorded through his own expectations of what was good or bad behavior, and of what constituted good or bad kingship, and it was against these values that he judged political actions and political actors" (6). What is important to me is how Malmesbury's work can be read.
[27] Nothing is gained from the Latin, although with questions of word choices, specifically about demonic terminology, I made sure to reference both, compare, and note if there was a significant difference.

	devil] between Offa and Charles (Malmesbury 128).
Alfred 871-899	Alfred's body is animated by "dæmone agente" [an agent of the devil] (Malmesbury 194).
Edward 899-924	Edward is given a "dæmonum visione terrificarer" [terrifying vision of the devil] related to the curse of the Norman Conquest that will occur upon his death (Malmesbury 449).
William the Conqueror 1066-1087[28]	Under William the Conqueror, one of the signs that England is cursed is that "visibiliter diabolus apparuit hominibus in saltibus" [the devil appeared to men in the spring/woods] (Malmesbury 506).

Table 1: Terms Used to Demonize Figures in Gesta regum Anglorum

[28] In *Gesta regum Anglorum,* the devil is also mentioned in association with other figures. St. Dunstan is tormented by "dæmonis" (Malmesbury 229). Gerbert is associated with "se occulit" [the occult] and performs "incantationes diabolo" [incantations of the devil] and works with a "dæmone" (Malmesbury 274) and Palumbus fights against demons, "adversus dæmones" (Malmesbury 352), "singuli dæmones" (Malmesbury 353), "dæmonibus" (Malmesbury 354), and connects "magicas" to "dæmones" (Malmesbury 355).

Demonic Kings

The first time the devil is mentioned in *Gesta regum Anglorum* he describes Ceolred (Æthelred's son and King of Mercia from 709-716). *Gesta* characterizes Ceolred[29] as devilish for his evil actions, he is defined by his sins, against women, against the Church, and his personal sins of gluttony and pride. He is "in converse with" devils (Malmesbury 75). Malmesbury states Ceolred's behavior is a lesson in what leaders should avoid:

> For Ceolred, your predecessor, the debaucher of nuns, the infringer of ecclesiastical privileges, was seized, while splendidly regaling with his nobles, by a malignant spirit, who snatched away his soul without confession and without communion, while in converse with the devil and despising the law of God. He drove Osred also, king of the Deirans and Bernicians, who was guilty of the same crimes, to such excess that he lost his kingdom and perished in early manhood by an ignominious death. (Malmesbury 75)

Ceolred's sins are against the institution of the Church as well as the people who make up the Church, he is a "debaucher of nuns, the infringer of ecclesiastical privileges" (Malmesbury 75). The debauchery of the nuns is rape, the infringing on Church rights, Ceolred also usurps the Church's right to collect monies, falling under pillaging. Ceolred's personal sins are gluttony and pride as he is taken while "splendidly regaling with his nobles" where "splendidly" implies excess and gluttony while "regaling" implies

[29] Despite Mercia's status as a separate kingdom, William's presents it as part and parcel with England, part of a unified country.

boasting and pride. The malignant spirit seizes him during this public display of Ceolred's sins. Ceolred's greatest sin is his self-centeredness, the fact that he places his own interests above his duty to the nation.

Ceolred's devilish leadership has personal and national consequences. His soul is damned because of his personal actions, his sin. He is also damned because the malignant spirit snatches "his soul without confession and without communion." This line parallels the interaction between the malignant spirit and Ceolred that has an unclear referent, "while in converse with the devil[30] and despising the law of God." Is it the spirit who is in converse or Ceolred? It seems an odd reference if it refers to the spirit as his identification as malignant spirit marks him as demonic and an adversary of God. On the other hand, if we read it as a description of Ceolred, it is the ultimate confirmation that Ceolred is a devilish leader. The unclear referent can be interpreted that there is no difference between the spirit and Ceolred. Ceolred's personal and larger sins against the Church are actions that could have been confessed and repented but conversing with the devil cannot be repented. The lesson to Malmesbury's audience is that some actions can be confessed, repented, and forgiven, but some actions are too devilish, too evil to recover from, personally and nationally. Ceolred is not a good king by any measure because good kings ensure peace, defend the realm, are pious, and support the Church (Weiler 7). His debauchery shows his lack of piety. His actions against the Church threaten ecclesiastical authority and highlight his lack of faith. Ceolred's described actions are a danger because they can potentially infect the nobles and therefore infect and affect the nation. Ceolred is "immoral and depraved" (Weiler 8), his personal and

[30] The Latin term used here is "diabolo."

royal failings ensure his damnation and threaten England. His immorality could spread to the nobles, weakening the moral fiber of the nation.

Ceolred is the object of the lesson in the consequences of demonic leadership but Ethelbald[31] is the audience. Ethelbald (King of Mercia 716-757) was Ceolred's cousin, exiled by him, although Ethelbald succeeded him and the Mercian kingdom became the dominant Anglo-Saxon kingdom under his reign. Boniface's epistle to Ethelbald frames for Ceolred's tale. Boniface opens his letter with concern for Ethelbald's actions:

> We confess before God that when we hear of your prosperity, your faith, and good works, we rejoice; and if at any time we hear of any adversity befallen you, either in the chance of war or that jeopardy of your soul, we are afflicted. (Malmesbury 74)

Ceolred was immoral and lacked a spiritual leader to guide him. Boniface seeks to be that leader to Ethelbald so he can become a good king. Boniface's letter presents a cautionary tale and draws a parallel between Ethelbald's sins and the potential consequences if Ethelbald continues to sin:

> Your contempt for lawful matrimony, were it for chastity's sake, would be laudable; but since you wallow in luxury and even in adultery with nuns, it is disgraceful and damnable; it dims the brightness of your glory before God and man, and transforms you into an idolater, because you have polluted the temple of God. (Malmesbury 74)

---

[31] Ethelbald is Malmesbury's spelling as provided in Giles' translation, while Æthelbald is the commonly accepted form.

Ethelbald's sin parallels Ceolred's debauching of nuns by committing adultery with them. There is also the parallel between Ethelbald's "luxury" and Ceolred's excess as seen with his "splendidly regaling with his nobles" (Malmesbury 75). Boniface lists Ethelbald's current sins, then describes his damned end, what awaits Ethelbald if he does not repent.

Boniface's description of Ceolred's sins is walks a fine line, he must frame his advice in a way that Ethelbald will learn from without angering him so he will not listen. The phrasing is that of a spiritual father to son, and frames itself as a way for Ethelbald to avoid eternal consequences for his actions. Boniface states he has Ethelbald's and the nation's best interests at heart:

> Wherefore, my beloved son, repent, and remember how [sic] dishonourable it is, that you, who, by the grant of God, are sovereign over many nations, should yourself be the slave of lust to his disservice. Moreover, we have heard that almost all the nobles of the Mercian kingdom, following your example, desert their lawful wives and live in guilty intercourse with adulteresses and nuns. (Malmesbury 74)

While *Gesta* focuses more on the formation and importance of the nation, here Boniface emphasizes the divine right of the monarchy, a key element in Chapters Two, Three, and Four. For the larger purposes of *Gesta regum Anglorum,* "all the nobles of the Mercian kingdom, following your example" is the key phrase here. The issue is not just Ethelbald's personal sin, a betrayal of the nation and the Church. The worst possible consequence of Ethelbald's actions is that his actions could contaminate the rest of the

leadership and people of England. Boniface is concerned with Ethelbald's and England's soul, "Spare therefore your own soul, spare a multitude of people, perishing by example, for whose souls you must give account" (Malmesbury 74). If Ethelbald can save himself, he can save England. The future of the "nation of the Angles" (Malmesbury 74) is at stake if Ethelbald continues his behaviors. Sinful and devilish leaders like Ceolred "will destroy the country by their abandoned manners, as was the case with Burgundians, Provençals, and Spaniards, whom the Saracens harassed for many years on account of their past transgressions" (Malmesbury 75). Like ancient beliefs that linked the health of the king to the health of the land,[32] Boniface links the spiritual health of Ethelbald to the stability and prosperity of the nation.

Like Ceolred's, Ethelbald's sins are both against God—which threatens the nation—and against the Church as God's representative on Earth:

> Moreover, it has been told us, that you take away from the churches and monasteries many of their privileges, and excite, by your example, your nobility to do the like. But recollect, I entreat you, what terrible vengeance God hath inflicted upon former kings, guilty of the crime we lay to your charge. (Malmesbury 75)

By cheating one of the three estates, the Church, Ethelbald weakens the nation. Ethelbald, like Ceolred, steals from the Church, and is an "infringer of ecclesiastical privileges" (Malmesbury 75). By the time Ceolred's cautionary tale is presented in six short lines, the

---

[32] Folklore states that the king must be healthy and whole in order for the land to prosper. For example, in Irish folklore, the Tuatha Dé tradition stated that their king must be physically perfect. Nuada is a rare exception, allowed to serve as king even after losing his arm.

parallels between Ethelbald and Ceolred are clear. His sinful behavior infects his nobles, another estate vital to the stability of the nation. Ethelbald's behavior specifically threatens England's status as a Christian nation. Religious and political transgressions negatively impact England. If Ethelbald does not change his behavior, start to live rightly and provide the proper example to his nobles, then England's future is in danger. Ethelbald could be carried away by malignant spirits like Ceolred was, personally damned and leaving England with no leadership, endangering the nation and its people.

The Consequences of Devilish Leadership

The story of Ceolred and Ethelbald's devilish leadership focuses on their personal consequences while the frame narratives imply the national one. Later in the chronicle Malmesbury describes just how dire the national consequences of devilish leadership can be. Per Malmesbury, the Norman Conquest was one of these consequences:

> These men, announcing themselves as the messengers of God, spake to the following effect: 'Since the chiefs of England, the dukes, bishops, and abbats [sic], are not the ministers of God, but of the devil, God, after your death, has delivered this kingdom for a year and a day, into the hand of the enemy, and devils shall wander over all the land.' (Malmesbury 252)

When Edward the Confessor, the last Anglo-Saxon king, dies in 1066 England's future is in peril. The devilish leadership of the "the chiefs of England, the dukes, bishops, and abbats" result in the Norman Conquest. The very people who are supposed to ensure England's success and future are the ones threatening it. England is lost for a year and a day as "devils shall wander over all the land." This reading of the Norman Conquest as devilish is problematic given Malmesbury's Anglo-Norman status. Yet it functions in the

same way as his Arthur references, the devil is to blame for the Conquest and the aftermath, so Malmesbury shifts the blame and then dismisses the events. Malmesbury's insertion here of the devil for blame is unique although blaming events on a bad king is not. The *Peterborough Chronicles* (1135-1154) lists King Stephen's sins and links them to the suffering of the nation. It characterizes the civil war (1139-1154) as evil and unfortunate, but not demonic (Rositzke 159). Malmesbury's narrative is more elegant and satisfying because he does not only list the problems but also provides the mechanism of restoration. Once the evil is defeated, good kings can triumph.

Many of these narratives occur at the end the lives of these leaders. The connection to death reinforces the consequences that await these men and England if current leaders do not read *Gesta* and heed its message. Corrupt canons attempt to ruin Alfred's good name and endanger his heir's legacy by besmirching Alfred's name after his death. Edward's death is not punishment. It is natural that at the end of someone's life a reckoning occurs, that one's soul is either condemned to hell or raised up to heaven. It is also natural that at the end of a king's life there would be issues of legacy, heirs, and what is left behind. Death and damnation are personal consequences, but the chaos that the death of a leader can have on the nation if there is no clear heir or succession are national and have large-scale consequences. While death can bring renewal, and hope, and serve as sacrifice. the threat of devilish adversary is always there, haunting the margins. Edward's visions say that good leadership can revive England a year and a day from Edward's death. There is also hope in the form of the messengers, "These men" who are "messengers of God," and therefore untainted by these devilish leaders bring the warning so all can know why England is suffering but also hope. "These men" illustrate

that Edward is faithful to the Church, learned men are distanced from the devilish leaders who caused England's predicament. William the Conqueror occupies an odd space here foreshadowed as "the enemy" with the Normans described as "devils," yet he also becomes the vehicle for the salvation of England, further evidence of the paradox that is inherent in England's national identity. Malmesbury deals with these in the same way he deals with all problematic historical issues, he mentions it and then ignores it. Malmesbury encapsulates the paradox in William the Conqueror. He is presented as a great warrior and king but his son's leadership of England is troubled and ultimately damned. Malmesbury does not, cannot, link this outcome to their Norman identity but it is easy to read his negotiation of these descriptions this way.

Weak and Bedeviled Men

While some leaders choose their infernal path, choosing vice over virtue and evil over good, there are also weak leaders, like the "useless kings" of Weiler's scholarship, who may not be innately evil but still negatively affect England. These men are often easily deceived by those who are innately evil and devilish. These weak leaders become bedeviled by these bad influences and in turn bedevil England. *Gesta Regum Anglorum* does not delineate a difference in England before or after the Norman Conquest yet William the Conqueror is still presented as a bridge character. He is not aligned with the devil or a devilish leader but he is not described as a good king either, his presence is neutral. Instead, Malmesbury focuses on his son, William II (1087-1100). Even though he begins as a model king, William II's narrative ends in tragedy. As "a prince incomparable" he could have been great if he had not been in his father's shadow and if he himself had not died young (Malmesbury 327). Despite his flaws, the English adore

him and "flocked" to support him (Malmesbury 330). William II is initially described as a "magnanimous king," "equal to Alexander the Great" (Malmesbury 332) with a "greatness of soul" (Malmesbury 334). At first a positive role model, his character soon declines: "vices, indeed, in place of virtues, so insensibly crept into his bosom" and "evil" grows in him (Malmesbury 334). He becomes cruel, severe (Malmesbury 334), extravagant and angry (335). As we saw with Ceolred, his sins do not stay personal but infect the public.[33] William II is never described as devilish or as associated with the devil. He is weak and his weakness leads to sin. It is the shared language with the previous examples in the chronicle of devilish leadership that constructs William II as demonic.

William II's sins soon affect his political leadership decisions. He sells the church's honors: "All military discipline being relaxed, the countries preyed upon the property of the country people, and consumed their substance, staking the very meat from the mouths of these wretched creatures" (Malmesbury 336). As we will see in Chapter Three, the personal does not stay personal, it soon has a national impact, infecting all aspects of life (Malmesbury 337). Malmesbury repeatedly states that he hates that he must be truthful and defame the king but he does try to balance his presentation of William II. He notes some incidents of magnanimity after the ninth year of his reign (Malmesbury 340): he builds a great building, albeit for his own glory (341). Yet even

---

[33] For more on this see Henry A. Myers's 1982 *Medieval Kingship* and Patrick Joseph Schwieterman's 2010 dissertation *Fairies, Kingship, and the British Past in Walter Map's De Nugis Curialium and Sir Orfeo.* While letters to kings become a popular genre throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the closest models for kingship are the Matter of England romances. For more on the letter writing as critique see David Matthews' 2010 *Writing to the King: Nation, Kingship and Literature in England 1250-1350.*

though *Gesta regum Anglorum* explains how William II is both a good role model and a devilish leader, *Gesta* ends William II's narrative with the consequences of his devilish and evil actions. The lesson of William II's rule is that kings could start out good, but if they are weak which enables them to become bedeviled, the consequences could be just as horrific as those of devilish leadership. Good leaders must not just be good, pious, and strong, but they must also be devoid of any weakness.

While the lesson of Ceolred is the consequences of a devilish leader's sin, the lesson of William II is that good men who are weak can become indistinguishable from evil men. Even though William II ultimately falls short, he at first demonstrates many of the characteristics of "ideal secular masculine behavior" (Fenton 755). He is a role model for English nobility in the beginning, a display of the "intrinsically masculine qualities" a good king should have (Fenton 757). William II as the heir and son of William the Conqueror inherits some of his father's traits, such as being a great warrior and leader with "the soul of Julius Caesar" (Malmesbury 341). But William II's personal failings and sins triumph. Soon thereafter William II's behavior affects England's prosperity: "Many sudden and sorrowful accidents happened in his time, which I shall arrange singly, according to the years of his reign" (Malmesbury 342). "Accidents" would seem to imply that these events are out of William's control, unavoidable. Yet the audience knows this is not true because the Author's Epistles and narrative frames of *Gesta regum Anglorum* connect the personal failings of William II's sins to national distress. These Acts of God that occur during William II's reign range from earthquakes in the second year of his reign to "a tempest of lightning" and "A stench so noisome followed, as to be insufferable to human nostrils" in his fourth year. The stench is described as "the

contrivances of the devil," defeated by monks with holy water (Malmesbury 342), highlighting the power of faith, something William II lacks. The severity of the accidents increases with a thunderstorm in the fifth year that destroys a church tower (Malmesbury 343), a "deluge from raine" during a hard winter in the sixth year, a "famine" that results in "agriculture failed," then a Welsh attack in the seventh year. A period of quiet follows with no other incidents until the tenth year when a comet appears, then Magnus the king of Norway invades in the eleventh year and the Thames floods in the twelfth year. In the thirteenth year, "which was the last of his life, there were many adverse events; but the most dreadful circumstance was that the devil visibly appeared to men in woods and secret places, and spoke to them as they passed by." William II is the first example Malmesbury provides of specific, dire, and far reaching consequences of bedeviled leadership. These events impact the daily lives of the polis for thirteen years. William's death as sacrifice restores natural order.

While William himself is never described as devilish, his sins impact the land, the agriculture, and the nation. The fact that William is not a good leader, is reinforced by his final judgment from God: "There, when the conversation turned upon king William, the abbat [Hugo, speaking to Anselm] aforesaid observed, 'Last night that king was brought before God; and by a deliberate judgment, incurred the sorrowful sentence of damnation'" (Malmesbury 344). William is first described as a great king because he is the promise for hope and salvation described after Edward's death, William the Conqueror's new beginning, yet his descent into sin makes him unfit to rule and influences England's atmosphere. While William the Conqueror is described as the salvation that Edward promised, this salvation only becomes possible after William II

dies. The lesson of William II is the dangers of weakness in a leader, particularly when there are no advisors or councilors to help guide a king who has lost his way, and has no spiritual beliefs to fall back on.

Devilish Religious Leaders

Malmesbury's primary focus in *Gesta regum Anglorum* is to guide and instruct present and future kings. Yet he also addresses outside influences that can contribute to the downfall of England's kings. While not the primary focus, Malmesbury constructs religious leaders who betray their ideals as demonic. In some ways, they are worse because they have betrayed God with their actions. These religious leaders betray both England's state as a Christian nation and the kings who rule. While it is hard to judge how Alfred was evaluated or viewed during his lifetime, his accomplishments were considerable, and would have had a large impact within his lifetime. He wrote and translated books, which increased literacy and raised the status of the national vernacular (Old English), founded the University of Oxford, and instituted political and administrative structures that shaped England. It is important to note that Alfred's structures were seen as bringing order, unlike the political constructions we will see in Chapter Two that are constructed as demonic. Both the actual structures of universities and libraries as well as the structures of administration and laws are evidence of Alfred's legacy. Alfred's reign, his success, is another example of the paradox and solution presented by the hereditary kingdom. Alfred should not have been king, there were four legitimate heirs before him. Malmesbury does not address the illegitimacy, only privileging his heredity, relegating Alfred's role as a bastard as immaterial as he does all

problematic items. All that matters is that he inherited his role and left a legacy behind that served as an inspiration for future leaders and England.

Initially, the superstitious description of King Alfred's death constructs him as devilish by associating him with the demonic, mainly the ability to animate a corpse. Malmesbury inserts the devil into the narrative:[34]

> They report that Alfred was first buried in the cathedral, because his monastery was unfinished, but that afterwards, on account of the folly of the canons, who asserted that the royal spirit, resuming its carcass, wandered nightly through the buildings, Edward, his son and successor, removed the remains of his father, and gave them a quiet resting-place in the new minster. These and similar superstitions, such as that the dead body of a wicked man runs about, after death, by agency of the devil, the English hold with almost inbred credulity, borrowing them from the heathens, according to the expression of Virgil. (Malmesbury 122)

The canons attack Alfred the man, who is inseparable from Alfred the king. The "folly of the canons" is that they try to construct Alfred, one of the great kings of England, as demonic. This attempt to taint his legacy is an attempt to destroy the structures that ensure England's continuation, both through the political structures he created and through his heir. Just as national identity can be constructed discursively through

---

[34] This is a popularly accepted ability of the devil and associated revenants. There are differences of opinion as to whether the devil possesses the body or whether the animation is an illusion, a mimicry of life (Hartnup 190), a trope that we will see again in Chapter Two.

language, here we see the canons attempt to unmake the king, and the nation's identity, through deceptive language.

Political, monarchial, and liturgical structures ensure England's longevity, so an attack on them is an attack on the nation. These canons are devilish because they try to destroy Alfred's legacy and works. Malmesbury argues that they try to contaminate "the Great" and the unified England he left behind. These devilish canons first construct Alfred as demonic by designating "the monastery which he had founded" (Malmesbury 121) as tainted by the powers of the devil, attacking the Church and its structures. Then they try to taint Edward, Alfred's son and heir, through their accusations. Alfred is defined by his "royal spirit," the enduring and "astonishing" legacy he leaves behind (Malmesbury 122). While he is not named as a saint he is a good man, a good king, and a role model. The canons are devilish because they slander Alfred personally, attempt to destroy his legacy, and threaten the divinely blessed monarchy. Just as *Gesta regum Anglorum* elicits the devil to mark lessons of poor leadership in this episode the evil canons try to use the devil to redefine Alfred's leadership as devilish. Just as the secular lessons on devilish leadership are framed as lessons to good leaders, here too this lesson is framed by Alfred's good works on one side and Edward's good works on the other with the evil of the canons in between. The answer to overcoming the devil and his evil works is power and structure, models, through good works and heirs. The lesson of this section is that foolish and evil works, devilish leadership, can be overcome with good works and good leadership.

Inspirational Figures and the Restoration of Order

It is easy to see that good leaders are defined in contrast to devilish leaders. Yet while we often acknowledge that nations and national identity are often defined against difference, we often ignore the uniqueness and distinction of the role models that represent these nations and national identity. While not every instance of devilish leadership is successfully countered by good leadership, Malmesbury states that good leadership is one mechanism for restoring natural order. Edward the Confessor (reigns 1042-1066) was a good king, blessed with visions from God. He foresees the "evils" that affected "the Hagarens, and Arabs, and Turks" and sees the deaths of great leaders, men brought down by "folly" and "wickedness" (Malmesbury 251). It is Edward's vision on his deathbed foretells the Norman Conquest and the devilish leadership that enabled it. Edward's piety and humility are also signs that he is a good king, "confessing himself a sinner, and that the works of holy men did not belong to him" (Malmesbury 248). He is also able to perform miracles, "The water in which the king's hands had been washed" cures blindness. *Gesta* describes Edward as having "perfect virtue" (Malmesbury 248). Edward's only fault is his childlessness, his lack of heir, which is one of the elements that historians credit for opening the way for the Norman Conquest. Malmesbury sidesteps this by making the Conquest instead the fault of devilish leaders. Edward does highlight of the problems with a "hereditary kingdom" and how the kingdom suffers when there is no clear line of succession.

From the beginning, Malmesbury frames the national project of England as a hereditary one where hereditary is not a guarantee of good leadership, only a consistent one. Just as a great leader can have a corrupt heir, so too the reverse can happen with a

devilish leader having a savior as an heir. Likewise, a childless king such as Edward opens the door for kings or conquerors who violate the ideals of good leadership, although Malmesbury's unbroken, fictional narrative ignores this. Edward does try to get his brother Edmond's son Edward to come to rule England (Malmesbury 253) but he dies, breaking the line. As Malmesbury recounts it, Edward's daughter Margaret marries Malcolm, king of Scotland, and it is her daughter Matilda who ends up marrying Henry I, the fourth son of William the Conqueror, thus reestablishing Malmesbury's unbroken narrative of England's monarchy.

Celtic mythology often employs the imagery of the king marrying the land, and by doing so, gaining favor with the goddess, an arrangement that benefits both the king and the nation. If the king broke faith with his oath, his *geasa,* his people and the land suffered. As we have seen, devilish leaders can be read in the same manner. They can infect and contaminate the land and adversely affect their people. Yet, the inverse is also true. A good king, a true king, can inspire a nation, create order, and ensure the success and prosperity of its people. Malmesbury presents this restoration of order as inevitable even if the journey is long and/or difficult. While the canons sought to negate Edward as Alfred's heir and Alfred's legacy, they only reveal themselves as devilish leaders and their attempts fail. As we will see in Chapters Two through Four, divinely ordained order always triumphs over demonic disruptions and attempts to wrest power. Edward embodies the traits that make a good king, "virtus," virtue (Fenton 758) and restraint (Fenton 759). He refuses to believe that his father's corpse is animated through the "agency of the devil," proving he is a model of faith. The lesson of Alfred reinforces the goodness of Edward. Poor and good leadership is often described by how well men

conform to "models of masculinity to be rejected or emulated" (Fenton 767). *Gesta* does not define men through masculinity, instead it puts men into three categories; devilish, weak, or inspirational. There is no gray area in the text, and no middle ground for leadership. One is a good and righteous king, or not. Ceolred and William II are rejected because their vices make them poor role models while Edward's virtues make him an excellent role model. Within *Gesta*, the criteria for good leaders are clear.

In addition to presenting all of England's history as a continuous, unified narrative, *Gesta regum Anglorum* elevates English kings by describing them on the same level as great rulers such as Charlemagne. Yet the text only evokes the devil in one of these instances, King Offa, a Mercian King from 757-796. In *Gesta,* Offa is described as on par with Charlemagne, who rules from 768-814, unites Western Europe, reforms Church structure, standardizes the liturgy, and is named Emperor of the Romans by the Pope. His accomplishments are so great that he is one of the Nine Worthies, and *Gesta regum Anglorum* describes King Offa as his equal. Offa controlled Midland, Sussex, and East Anglia, but as an overlord who sought to consolidate his power, not for nationalistic unity. Offa also left no legacy as his son was quickly deposed, another example of the issues that childlessness presents in a hereditary kingdom. Offa and Charlemagne are linked in *Gesta* through correspondence, some of the first surviving documents produced in English diplomatic history. In *Gesta's* description, "I know not what will be our destination, for some ground of difference, fomented by the devil, has arisen between King Charles[35] and king Offa, so that, on both sides, all navigation is prohibited the merchants" (Malmesbury 84-85). This correspondence and Malmesbury's descriptions

[35] How Malmesbury names Charlemagne.

present Offa and Charlemagne as great kings, operating on the same global scale, making decisions that affect the entire known world.

At first Offa appears elevated because he is described as worthy of the devil's attention. The word choices of "destination," "navigation," and "merchants" make Offa and England worthy of the devil's attention, for their role in global economic and political events. Taken one step further, the combined works and alliance of Charlemagne and Offa are so vital that the devil feels the need to "forment"[36] trouble between the two to counter the divine actions of these kings, which elevates the men, and their actions, and their works. Yet Offa is not described for his own goodness, instead his status as a role model is presented through the lens of Charlemagne's goodness. Offa is elevated through his association with "Charles the Great." By providing proof "of the magnanimity and valour of Charles" (Malmesbury 84), *Gesta regum Anglorum* provides proof of Offa's goodness. There are no descriptions of Offa's goodness or his own merits, only the frame of Charlemagne presented through a letter. Offa is the "esteemed and dearest brother" of Charlemagne (Malmesbury 85). While this presentation puts the two kings on an equal footing, we can also read Charlemagne's letter as evidence of Offa's shortcomings. Charlemagne lectures Offa on how to treat pilgrims and traders. When added to the lack of evidence of Offa's goodness or any listing of qualities that make him a role model, it is easy to read Offa's exchanges with Charlemagne as his only redeeming quality. Through this lens, perhaps the devil does not target Offa and England so much for their own importance and goodness but for Charlemagne's. In the end, the reasons

[36] This is the spelling that appears in Giles's text.

why England and her leader is targeted is immaterial to the purpose of Malmesbury's work, only that Offa is presented as an inspirational model.

Gesta regum Anglorum's fiction of king Offa and England's importance during this time presents Offa as a strong king dedicated to uniting England to form a great nation, as Charlemagne unites Europe to form the Holy Roman Empire. Malmesbury "invents nations where they do not exist" (Geller 6) or rather Malmesbury invents a nation that did not exist. Offa's interests were power and conquest, not nationalism and unity. Malmesbury's presentation of Offa seems to indicate that Offa was aware of his shortcomings, as he attempts to align with Charlemagne through marriage. He is unsuccessful, and this attempt dissolves any alliance they once had. In his presentation of Offa, Malmesbury imagines an English nation that can participate in global events, on a grand scale and again ignores the facts that do not fit his unified narrative. By writing Offa as on par with Charlemagne and presenting England as equal to the Holy Roman Empire he imagines an English nation that can rule the world, if only it has the right leadership.

Offa's tale is presented as a lesson to "Kenulf, king of the Mercians" (796-821), a framed narrative in the form of a letter from Pope Leo, similar to what we saw with Ceolred, Bonifice, and Ethelbald. Kenulf's rule dealt with revolts and conflicts with the Church over control of monies and religious houses as well as appointments to these houses. Offa's tale is presented as what Kenulf should aspire to and it appears to have worked:

> Kenulf was a truly great man, and surpassed his fame by his virtues, doing nothing that malice could justly find fault with.

> Religious at home, victorious abroad, his praises will be deservedly extolled so long as an impartial judge can be found in England. Equally to be admired for the extent of his power and for the lowliness of his mind; of which he gave an eminent proof in restoring, as we have related, its faltering dignity to Canterbury, he little regarded earthly grandeur in his own kingdom at the expense of deviating from anciently-enjoined canons. (Malmesbury 86-87)

Kenulf's narrative presents a role model for good leadership and what is at stake during this time. Under Kenulf's rule Mercia is successful and the Church is supported. Once he is gone "the kingdom of the Mercians sank from its prosperity, and becoming nearly lifeless, produced nothing worthy to be mentioned in history" (Malmesbury 87). Just as the nation can suffer from devilish leadership, so too can it suffer in the sudden absence of good leadership, or if the hereditary monarchy breaks down. Malmesbury's fictional guide for current and future rulers has one constant moral, that a single man, devilish or inspirational, can shape the fate of England.

Malmesbury's *Gesta* creates and chronicles a fictional founding of England that functions in several key ways. It gathers together the separate nations of Angles, Saxons, Mercians, and Northumbrians, and rewrites them so they are all English. Then, when the Normans enter the narrative they are seamlessly integrated, rewritten as English. Finally, problematic issues like the warlike, savage, native Britons are written out of history. They can inspire legend, but they must ultimately be erased from the narrative, purposely contained, or overcome. The legacy and deeds of some kings are elevated, while others are constructed as demonic. Each aspect of this fiction serves the single purpose of

imagining an England that will inspire leaders to ensure the imagined becomes the reality.

In Malmesbury's imagined England, the nation and its people are prosperous when good men make decisions for the good of the nation. These men bring order to the land, establish political structures, and the land prospers. These men then inspire others and trace the strength of their power to hereditary kingship. Yet these men often have no control over the character of their heirs or the decisions they will make. Sometimes these men are simply weak, unable to make decisions or lead. Sometimes they are susceptible to evil influences. These weak men can become bedeviled themselves, tempted or seduced by evil, and run the risk of becoming devilish leaders, the group Malmesbury identifies as the greatest threat to England. These men bedevil the nation. These infernal men, these devilish leaders, are innately political as are the effects of their actions. They endanger the success and future of England as a nation. Religious leaders who are devilish are also threats to order, structure, and the nation. In *Gesta,* Malmesbury imagines England as a hereditary kingdom, held up by political structures that are created by good kings, which can offer some resistance and resilience, to those who seek to break these down. Yet as we will see in Chapter Two, as power shifts away from the monarchy as the sole authority, and begins to represent the voice of the people through Parliament, these democratic voices are constructed as demonic for the potential threats they represent to England.

Chapter Two: The Democratic Collective as Demonic Parliament in A *Song Called Þe Deulis Perlament, OR Parlamentum of Feendis*

In William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum* (*Gesta*) devilish leaders and the role models who resist them provide valuable lessons to current and future rulers on how to ensure England's success as a nation. *Gesta,* like Matter of England romances such as *Havelock the Dane,* are like the genre of Mirror of Princes, providing examples for leaders. The genre of the mirror for princes is "offered as instructions to the prince for his self-formation and for the sake of the commonweal or common good" (Giancarlo, "Mirror, Mirror" 37). The lesson of *Þe Deulis Perlament's* (*ÞDP*) (1430) is different in several key ways. The first is that while *Gesta* reinforces the legitimacy of England's power structure as represented by the monarchy, *ÞDP* questions structures and authority. The audience for *Þe Deulis Perlament* is a popular one.[37] Instead of a how-to-rule manual with specific noble exemplars, *ÞDP* proffers general object lessons targeted at a more general populace. The inclusion of "Song" in the title provides further guidance for how to read the purpose and audience. In general, folk and satirical songs from the medieval period have not survived. There are some lyrics, ballads, that survive mostly through inclusion in other genres such as poetry.[38] There were the *chanson de geste*, and troubadour lyrics. None of these songs, however, were in the English vernacular or functioned as satire. The closest we get to satirical songs are later ballads such as *Robin*

---

[37] C.W. Marx implies this by stating the audience, and the didactic purpose, is similar to *Legenda Aurea* (*Rights and the Redemption* 46) which has a popular audience and *Chasteau d'Amour* which also had a popular audience (*Rights and the Redemption* 65).
[38] There is some evidence that the genre of song was a signifier of nationalistic and myth making work such as seen in *The Song of Roland* (1040-1115), *The Songs of the Nibelungs* (1200), the Spanish *Cantar de Mio Cid* [The Song of My Lord] (1140) but more research needs to be done in this area.

Hood and Other Outlaw Tales (pre-1600) but it is problematic to analyze these songs, as many are not written down until the seventeenth or eighteenth century, although many scholars trace their original appearances to the medieval period.

I argue that in *A Song Called Þe Deulis Perlament, OR Parlamentum of Feendis* (*ÞDP*) the political structure of parliament and its collective, democratic nature is demonized to present the voice of the people as a threat to England, a reflection of historical anxieties about Parliament.[39] There is little scholarship on *Þe Deulis Perlament* except for C. W. Marx's annotated edition of *Þe Deulis Perlament* and his 1995 *The Devil's Rights and the Redemption in the Literature of Medieval England*.[40] While infernal councils appear in a number of Biblical epics and continental literature, they are only present in four key English works written in the vernacular, *Þe Deulis Perlament, Prose Merlin* (1450), "Play 23: Parliament of Hell: Temptation" from the *N-Town Plays* (1460-1520), and *Paradise Lost* (1667/1674). Each of these works contains many elements of classical and continental infernal councils, but English texts contribute and share a strong emphasis on the structure, creation, and the purpose of the parliament. I argue these texts construct the members of the democratic collective as demonic because they represent the *vox populi.* Speech, its persuasiveness, the power of rhetoric, and the danger inherent in the consequences of this, is also constructed as demonic. Surprisingly, outside of Milton's presentation of infernal councils in *Paradise Lost,* scholarship has not

---

[39] When referring to the generic term I use "parliament." When referring to the specific English political structure I use "Parliament." As I believe *ÞDP* operates as a critique of the latter, I use "Parliament" in my analysis.

[40] Marx also addressed the B text in 2013's "The Devil as Narrator of the Life of Christ and Sermo Literarius." The information presented in 1980's "The Develis Perlament" is better covered in his book.

engaged this trope in English literature,[41] and what little there is traces instances where it appears but does not analyze these instances, especially not for their political significance.[42] *Þe Deulis Perlament* presents demonic political and physical structures as pale imitations of heavenly ones. Reading *ÞDP* through Jean Baudrillard's methodology in *Simulacra and Simulation* (1981) reveals that the demonic structure of a parliament in *ÞDP* mimics real, heavenly ones, ultimately only reinforcing the natural, divine authority. The demonic mimicry of the structure and function of parliament also illustrates Mikhail Bakhtin's concepts of carnival and lords of misrule as explained in *Rabelais and His World* (1984). Usually, demonic parliaments reinforce divine authority and result in the restoration of order but the lesson of *ÞDP's* infernal council is that it is demonic because it is democratic, the dangers represented by the people's speech, and the power of their rhetoric.

The History of Parliament

The term "parliament" first appears in the 13th century and is defined as a court or council summoned by the monarch" (*OED*). It is borrowed from the French *parlement,* meaning a discussion, conversation, meeting or council (ca. 1100), then as a "deliberative council or assembly" (ca. 1165-1181), and eventually as a royal council by 1260. Yet despite this French origin, "parliament" is not used in France as we think of it until the

[41] James Frederic Cool's 1978 dissertation *The Infernal Council in the Sixteenth-Century Biblical Epic*) is invaluable for the background research on infernal councils as was Olin H. Moore's 1918 "The Infernal Council."

[42] Part of this may be due to issues with identifying the genre; *ÞDP* is named as a "Song" yet the poem has much in common with drama and performance (Silber 224-5), so it does not fit neatly into any one category. Another may be confusion over even identifying the text. It is listed under *Þe Deulis Perlament,* "The Parliament of Devils," "The Parliament of Fiends," and "The Develis Perlament."

constitutional monarchy in 1830-48, "les Chambres" was used.[43] *The Middle English Dictionary* defines parliament first as "discourse, communication, conversation" and then as a "consultation; a formal conference, an assembly" with its roots in "holden, maken, setten" all of which are associated with the counsel given in assembly and appear in *ÞDP*. In its first appearances in *South English Legendary* (ca. 1300) and *Sir Orfeo* (1330), it is used in association with the king. The term has its roots in speech and politics, with the word appearing at roughly the same time the political structure does. While 1215 and the Magna Carta is often named as the impetus for forming Parliament, giving barons a voice, it was Henry III in 1258 who was forced into the Provisions of Oxford that broke the absolute rule of the Anglo-Norman monarchy and sets the pattern of fifteen barons regularly meeting with the king, three times a year. While modern understandings may associate Parliament with the voice of the common people, in the beginning it represented ruling class landowners. Despite this, the English Parliament has almost always been associated with rebellion. In the late 13th century, Simon de Montfort led a rebellion that used Parliament to challenge the king, and set a pattern of acting as an adversary to the monarchy. Montfort's rebellion was short lived, but one effect of it was that Henry began to use Parliament regularly, perhaps to cut off any complaints which led to the creation of the Magna Carta. Edward I (reign 1272-1307) who used Parliament only when it was

---

[43] "Parliament" was used in France throughout the medieval and early modern period but it referred to a judicial body/council, it did not stand for the representative political body of the people. For more on this see D. Brown and A. Bell's 1702 *The History of France from the Origin of that Nation to the Year 1702: Containing, Besides All the Material Transactions in Peace and War, a Particular Account of the Steps Taken by Their Late Princes, to Subvert Their Civil Liberties, and to Extirpate the Reformed Religion ... To which is Added, the Antient and Present State of France, as to Its Constitution and Government, the Royal Family, the Nobility, and Offices Civil and Military &c.*

convenient for his plans to unite England, Wales, and Scotland through conquest and ignored them otherwise. The non-noble attendees were first called "Commons" for their role in representing the community at large at the "Model Parliament" in 1295.1327 was one of the first instances of Parliament demonstrating its power when they deposed Edward II and established Edward III as king. In 1341, Edward III split the structure of Parliament into two houses (later named the House of Lords and House of Commons) and it was also under Edward III that Parliament's power in regard to taxes and law grew. Parliament also played a key role in the events that led up to the Peasant's Revolt of 1381. In response to changing economies because of the Black Death (1348), Parliament enacted laws that tried to mitigate the economic impact of the plague like the Statue of Labour in 1351 which prohibited laborers from moving to find better jobs and/or an increase in wages. In addition to these pressures there was also the newly emerging concept of a middle class, a cause of anxiety, and impetus for the short-lived Peasant's Revolt. John Gower and William Langland provide clues as to how the ruling class viewed the lower class and the emerging merchant and middle class. Gower wrote *Vox Clamantis,* in reaction to the revolt, and describes the third estate as "lazy" while Langland raises the concern in *Piers Plowman* (1368-74, 77-81, 81-85) that prosperity would lead to Sloth. It used to be accepted that the Revolt was made up of mostly rural folk, but more recent scholarship, such as Juliet Barker's *England Arise: The People, the King and the Great Revolt of 1381,* points to the artisanal and emerging middle class as the majority participants, those most impacted by these economic and political changes which potentially empowered the middle class and threatened the nobles.

While short-lived, the voice of the people was influential enough for the Crown to intervene. Richard II attempted to parley with them, but was unsuccessful. The rebels briefly took London, with mass destruction occurring during their short occupation. In response, Richard capitulated and promised to abolish serfdom. However, this was just a stalling tactic, which he quickly backtracked, and the revolt spread. While the revolt may have been temporary, with the rebels hunted down and killed within a month, the historical moment reflects several key shifts in England. First, while the Revolt did not result in immediate changes it did signify the beginning of a political shift away from a system that privileged the power of the nobility.[44] Second, it was a lesson in the political impact of national economics and personal trauma on national interests. Finally, while Richard II was able to regain control in 1381, and nominally allowed to stay in power after the "Merciless Parliament" of 1388, [45] this Parliament strips him of a lot of power. He takes his revenge in 1397, dismissing the council, and murdering his uncle Gloucester during the "Revenge Parliament."

For the most part, Parliament was defined in opposition to the monarchy, in some cases because the ruling class did not want to be ruled, and then later as the concerns of the common man were less and less aligned with the goals of the monarchy. In 1430, the time of *Þe Deulis Perlament,* the men serving in Commons were property owners who often actively worked against the monarchy. While not all Parliaments were given

---

[44] For more on the scope and impact of the Peasant's Revolt see Juliet R. Barker's 2014 *1381: The Year of the Peasants' Revolt*, R. H. Hilton's 1973 *Bond Men Made Free: Medieval Peasant Movements and the English Rising of 1381*, and Steven Justice's 1994 *Writing and Rebellion: England in 1381*.

[45] Richard's favorites, Robert de Vere, Duke of Ireland, Michael de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk, The Archbishop of York, Chief Justice Trevelyan and Bember, Mayor of London, were all convicted of treason.

nicknames, many were, as the chart below shows, with the names providing clues as to the relationship between Parliament, the common people, and the monarchy:

Date	King	Name of Parliament	Points of Discussion
1258	Henry III	Mad Parliament	Montfort’s rebellion
1295	Edward I	Model Parliament	Beginning of Commons
1320	Robert I	Black Parliament	Parliament tries the conspirators who tried to kill and replace Robert as king
1321	Edward II	Parliament of Whitebands	Parliament met without clergy and attempted to act against the King’s advisors
1376	Edward III	Good Parliament	Corruption and money
1377		Bad Parliament	Gaunt’s power
1386	Richard II	Wonderful Parliament	Reform of power structures
1388		Merciless Parliament	Accusing members of Richard’s court of treason
1399	Henry IV	Convention Parliament	Offered throne to Henry
1404		Unlearned Parliament, also known as Lawless Parliament, Parliament of Dunces	Commons tried to dictate how the king ran his court
1414	Henry V	Fire and Faggot Parliament	Burning Lollards for treason
1415		Parliament of 1415 (no nickname given)	Approved taxes to fund war in France

1416		Parliament of 1416 (no nickname given)	
1426	Henry VI	Parliament of Bats	Henry VI knighted
1459		Parliament of Devils	High treason accusations against nobles
1485-1509	Henry VII	(No nicknames given during this time period)	By far the most contentious relationship between a monarch and Parliament in the medieval period. Henry only called Parliament to approve taxes, and they only met seven times between1485 and 1509, with most these meetings occurring the first ten years (1485 and 1495).
1523	Henry VIII	Black Parliament	Cardinal Wolsey sought control over speaker Sir Thomas More.
1536		Reformation Parliament[46]	Parliament whose legislation led to the English Reformation

Table 2: Named English Parliaments 1258-1536

[46] There are no other named Parliaments until The Blessed Parliament under James I in 1604.

A History of Infernal Councils

James Frederic Cool's 1981 dissertation "The Infernal Council in the Sixteenth Century Biblical Epic" argues that infernal councils in literature have specific elements and norms. *Þe Deulis Perlament* conforms to and deviates from these common outlines in very particular ways. Infernal councils are associated with the Harrowing of Hell, have their roots in the fifth century addition to the Gospel of Nicodemus, and mimic divine councils, like the council of the gods seen in the *Aeneid* (Book X). Infernal councils appear in English literature starting in the fourteenth century,[47] gaining popularity in the fifteenth century, and reach the pinnacle with Milton's infernal councils in *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained.* Variations of infernal councils are present in the several English works: John Gower's *Mirour de l'Omme* (1376-79),[48] *A Song Called Þe Deulis Perlament, OR Parlamentum of Feendis* (1430),[49] *Prose Merlin* (1450),[50] "Play 23:

---

[47] They are present in Robert de Boron's French texts in the late 12th and 13th century.

[48] Gower's *Mirour de l'Omme* does present a parliamentary allegory (Giancarlo 436) which serves as a vehicle for anxieties; however, the word "parliament" is not used. Instead, Gower uses the commonly understood association between the law and compacts and the devil (Giancarlo 441, 443), a revision of the Theophilus legend. It is these legal associations, and their connections to debate and rhetoric that leads to characterizations of language as demonic that seen through the late middle ages and the early modern period. Gower's work is not included in my argument because it is not written in vernacular English which I argue represented the voice of the people, and because he does not evoke the term "parliament."

[49] I use C. W. Marx's edition. He also works with St. John College's MS B.6, which contains the sole edition of The Harrowing of Hell and Destruction of Jerusalem. The rare scholars that mention *Þe Deulis Perlament* often only cite *The Parliament of Devils* by Wynken de Worde (1509), which he publishes at the same time as an edition of The Gospel of Nicodemus.

[50] Both Robert de Boron and the Vulgate cycle with their Merlin associations feature infernal councils but they are never named as such and therefore are not listed here. Both the de Boron and Vulgate are French in origin, so like Gower, not representing the people through vernacular English sources and they do not use the term "parliament." It appears that the specific concept of a "parliament of devils" is a strictly English idea.

Parliament of Hell: Temptation" from the *N-Town Plays* (1460-1520), and *Paradise Lost* (1667/1674). Aside from the four English works discussed in this chapter, and the analysis of *Paradise Lost's* infernal councils in Chapter Four, infernal councils are also present in the Italian works including Boccaccio's *Filocolo* (1335-36), Valli's *Jesuida* (1446),[51] Mantuan's *Parthenice II* (1501), Sannazaro's *De Partu Virginis* (1526), Vida's *Christiad* (1535), and Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata* (1581). However, these Italian texts have more in common with classical councils than English infernal councils. Cool identifies specific steps/stages that define the infernal council such as:

1. The ruler of hell meditates on his enemies' successes.
2. He calls to council his subject-demons.
3. He delivers a formal speech, explaining the problem.
4. One or more fiends reply to his speech.
5. A plan for action is announced.
6. The Devil designates and dispatches a messenger or messengers to carry out this plan.
7. The messenger leaves hell, approaches his victim, and attempts to carry out his plan. (Cool 17)

Þe Deulis Perlament counters and revises several of these elements to make specific critiques about Parliament and speech. *Prose Merlin* (1450) and "Play 23: Parliament of Hell: Temptation" from the *N-Town Plays* (1460-1520) traverse similar terrain although those works while conforming to Cool's elements do not engage with the politic the way

[51] The manuscript of "Play 23" is dated 1468; however, this is only the date of this copy of the text and does not necessarily indicate the first performance of the play or when they would have entered the popular imagination, which is probably much earlier.

Þe Deulis Perlament does. I argue that *ÞDP* is unique because of its use of the innately political English devil versus the French inspired *Prose Merlin* or the modern popular performance of the more medieval, ethnically and visually different devil in "Play 23."

In literature set in hell, Cool's last two elements are not often seen, as the action never leaves the confines of hell. Yet the action of many early modern plays such as *Doctor Faustus* (1588), *The Devil is an Ass* (1616), and *The Witch of Edmonton* (1621/1658)[52] do not begin until the sixth step, which acts as the inciting incident for these dramas. While "every author to some degree alters this schema by adding, eliminating, or even rearranging the individual items" (Cool 17), many infernal councils include many these elements. The performances and display of debate in these councils emphasize the "futility" of the demonic councils' actions (Cool 23). No matter what the devils' stated goals are, these councils are doomed to fail. As in the Harrowing of Hell genres on which they are based, Christ always wins, and order is always restored. English infernal councils depict the hierarchy and power structure of the devils in hell, show a variety of devil figures, and reveal the devils' products as false. Both *Þe Deulis Perlament* and *Paradise Lost* feature two councils which bookend action; *Prose Merlin* and "Play 23" open with one.

While many infernal councils follow the structure from the Gospel of Nicodemus from the fifth century,[53] not all councils are created equal. These narratives are concerned

---

[52] Date performed/Date published.
[53] Scholarship on this Gospel tends to focus on its apocryphal nature, such as Bart D. Ehrman and Zlatki Pleše's 2011 *The Apocryphal Gospels: Texts and Translations,* and James E. Cross and Denis Brearley's 1996 *Two Old English Apocrypha and Their Manuscript Source: The Gospel of Nichodemus, and the Avenging of the Saviour* or tracing the history of a particular manuscript in which it appears such as David C.

with "issues surrounding Devil's rights" (Marx, *The Devil's Rights* 126) and place the devil within an ordered, Christian universe. They highlight the structure of the parliament and the dialogue as "a forum in which Christ and Lucifer debate the question of the redemption of humanity" (Marx, *Rights and the Redemption* 126). These narratives are bookended by infernal councils, with Christ's temptation in-between. These councils focus on the rights versus the responsibilities of the devil, the ways that Christ presents a challenge to these, and the correct order of God's universe. The lesson is always that the devil is part of the natural order but he has specific limitations on his power and influence. Later revisions of these infernal councils change the temporal setting of the action (before, during, or after the Harrowing) in both their comic[54] and dramatic forms. These devils may be rendered powerless although their didactic purpose, to instruct the audience, does not change.

Unlike the infernal councils in *Paradise Lost*, which we will see are also not named as "parliaments," the French councils serve no political function. Both Robert de

---

Fowler's 1988 "The Middle English Gospel of Nicodemus in Winchester MS 33," Betty Hill's 1959 "A Newly-Identified Middle English Prose Version of the Gospel of Nicodemus," and C. W. Marx's 1991 "A Newly Identified Fragment of the Anglo-Norman Prose 'Complaint of Our Lady' and 'Gospel of Nicodemus' in Cambridge University Library MS Dd.4.35." Phillip Fackler's 2015 "Adversus Adversus Iudaeos?: Countering Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Gospel of Nicodemus" and R. Hakola's 2009 "The Burden of Ambiguity: Nicodemus and the Social Identity of the Johannine Christians" are rare exceptions of more recent scholarship. See also Zbigniew Izydorczyk's 1996 *The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus: Texts, Intertexts, and Contexts in Western Europe.* Sona Rosa Burstein's 1928 "The Harrowing of Hell" is one of the only pieces of scholarship that examines this narrative through a folkloric lens although she focuses on the mythical comparisons.

[54] It is a common misconception that many medieval devils are comic. This misconception stems from comic devils in medieval dramas disproportionately represented in anthologies often taught and known resulting in this concept being presented as the majority. In reality, few devil figures are comedic.

Boron's Merlin romance (13th century) and the Vulgate Cycle (early 13th century) feature infernal councils, but do not name itself as parliament or council instead using more general collective terms; "Enemy," "one of the demons," "We," "another," "they all cried together" (Bryant 46) and "demons." While there is some overlap in how these gatherings of devils are constructed as a threat, the French sourced texts do not politicize these threats. While these texts avoid overt political messages, it is worth noting that the devils' endgame in these texts is a political one, to create a man who will act as their representative, and counter God's law and order. Despite these inherently political roles these texts avoid political commentary or critique. In French texts, the voices of the devils are given equal weight but they are not presented as a collective, another difference from English texts. The devils form their plan to create "a man who would work to deceive others" (Bryant 46) as a reaction to the Harrowing of Hell and their unsuccessful attempts to tempt Christ. Next, they plan to send a demonic emissary to Earth to create their advocate. The French texts feature much more elaborate plans to create this representative than the English sources do. First, the demon tricks a husband into action, and kills the man's son, which causes the man to lose faith, which results in him hanging his wife (Bryant 47). Next the devil disgraces the man's three daughters, getting one buried alive, another turned into a whore, and only after all this mischief and trouble does he complete his original mission and sleep with the remaining daughter to produce a demon son (Bryant 46-51). While this elaborate scheme is imported into the Vulgate Cycle it is cut down significantly in the English versions that only focus on the seduction of Merlin's mother. The action in both "Play 23" and *ÞDP* never leave hell, so they never move beyond step four of Cool's elements, and therefore never get to the

devil's plan and seduction.[55] In English texts the devils abandon their schemes once the harrowing begins.

In the Harrowing of Hell genre/narrative, Christ descends into hell after he dies at the Crucifixion but before the Resurrection. This narrative has several purposes, to bring salvation to the souls in hell, release them, and to show the devils Christ's true power. This scene in religious dramas is often centered on a didactic dialogue that takes place between Jesus and a devil figure who stands in for the whole. These medieval presentations focus on redemption and Jesus Christ's role as savior, not the devils who are just a means to an end, a trope. Even though no political use is made of the devil, the devil's innate political nature, his position as an adversary, and a representative of the collective, are still present. Harrowings often feature devils as stand-ins for the reader/audience, the receivers of Christ's lessons. *The York Corpus Christi Plays* includes a Harrowing, "Play 37," and a play with a similar format and message, "Play 27: Temptation in the Wilderness," but not as infernal council. *The N-Town Plays*, feature two Harrowings: "Play 33 Harrowing (1)" and "Play 35 Harrowing (2)" and a separate infernal council in "Play 23 Parliament of Hell: Temptation." Despite the name appearing in the title, "parliament" is not used in the play's text. Scholarship has largely failed to notice the differences between infernal councils and the Harrowing of Hell presentations.[56] In both scholarship and the works themselves there is also little distinction between infernal councils that serve political functions and those that do not. I

---

[55] The mayster deuyl states he will tempt Jesus, and accounts the temptation, but the action the reader "sees" does not leave the confines of hell.

[56] For more on this see Karl Tamburu's 2007 *The Harrowing of Hell in Medieval England* and J. A. MacCulloch's 1983 *The Harrowing of Hell.*

believe this is because the Harrowing is almost always discussed for its didactic and religious nature, neither of which is framed as political despite having political elements. This may be because this political devil has his roots in Maccabees, a potentially controversial set of books that deal with rebellion against a king.

C. W. Marx's few works on *Þe Deulis Perlament* represent the entirety of scholarship on this text. His arguments focus on sovereignty, nationalism, and power. Marx concentrates on the devil's place in divine structures and how he "is conceived as a figure within a model of society: the Devil is a servant of the king; he is a jailer, one who must do the will of the king and one who is treated in law like any of the king's servants" (*The Devil's Rights* 26). Marx's argument analyzes *ÞDP* as a revision of the Harrowing rather than focusing on the ways infernal councils operate differently from Harrowing narratives. He states that *Þe Deulis Perlament* concentrates on the Devil's deception, "issues associated with the redemption," and the text's connection to the Harrowing (Marx, *Rights and the Redemption* 126) ignoring the structure and historical background of the English Parliament. Placing *ÞDP* in the same context as Harrowing narratives does not consider all the pieces that do not fit that narrative. If, however, we analyze the text for the ways it conforms and counters other presentations of infernal councils, and historicizing them, more specific arguments about structure and what the devils represent can be made. While both infernal councils and Harrowings have didactic purposes, whether or not the lesson is learned is different in each case. *ÞDP*'s infernal council is inseparable from its political critique of Parliament and the demonizing of democratic speech. My argument overlaps with Marx's in that both of us analyze the devil's role within these structures; however, Marx focuses more on sources and analogues for the

parliament, whereas I analyze the parliaments in and of themselves, the arguments they make about nationalism and how they demonize political structures and the people represented by them.

While many of Cool's elements are present in *Þe Deulis Perlament* it is the differences that make the political arguments about the English Parliament. First, is the expansion of the presentation of the characters in the hierarchy. *ÞDP* includes devils, a master devil, Sathan, Lucyfer, and Belsabub—an expansion similar to those seen in medieval dramas where multiple devils appear onstage as both witnesses and audience members to reinforce the audience's complicity in sin.[57] The devils are the people. Second, *Þe Deulis Perlament* invokes creation imagery and metaphor without resulting in actual creation. The text employs phrases like "work" and seed and farming imagery, but these descriptions only reveal all demonic creations as false. Within *Þe Deulis Perlament,* the political and physical structures created in heaven are real while the devils' attempts at creation are simulacra:

> But what if God himself can be simulated, that is to say can be reduced to signs that constitute faith? Then the whole system becomes weightless, it is no longer anything but a gigantic simulacrum— not unreal, but simulacrum, that is to say never exchanged for the real, but exchanged for itself, in an uninterrupted circuit without reference or circumference. (Baudrillard 173)

[57] *Records of Early English Drama (REED*) note many characters identified as devils including specifically named Sathan, Lucifer, and demon as seen in Coventry, York, Chester, and Cambridge records.

The devils reproduce the signs, the outer forms of the system, but in doing so they only create a simulacrum not the real. The devils' focus on this creation on the demonic and false Pandæmonium becomes the first step in a cycle of the mimesis of creation, an "uninterrupted circuit." The initially stated purpose of the infernal council in *ÞDP* is the same as "Play 23's," to treat Jesus Christ as a normal man who can be tempted into sin, then punished by devils.[58] It is an attempt to show the strength of the devils but it only ends up highlighting the truth of Christ's power. The end of *Þe Deulis Perlament* highlights the ignorance of the devils, their inability to understand Jesus Christ or the ways of God, while also demonizing the structure of Parliament and the collective voices of the devils.

I argue *ÞDP*'s key arguments are present in the poem's introduction: first, the devils are a collective; second, the structure of parliament as their chosen shape; third, the devils' attempt to mimic creation ("Made a parlement" line 4),[59] and finally, their actions are a response to Mary's pregnancy and the presence of Jesus. Interwoven into these arguments is the fact that speech can be dangerous, demonic even, for its persuasive nature, and its ability to manipulate, and deceive. These elements form both the structures analyzed within the poem and the structure of the poem itself. The poem opens and ends with an emphasis on the devils as a collective body and the political structure they form.

---

[58] The council here is not making doctrinal statements about Christ's divinity or humanity as seen with the Arian heresy, rather the devils' focus is on the lost souls that are the domain of hell.

[59] Giancarlo links the parliamentary language in Gower's *Mirrour,* particularly the term "made a cry" to the idea of making and creation seen in other infernal councils. (Giancarlo *Mirrour* 450). Part II of *Mirrour* uses the words "complaint," "cry," "murmur," "clamour," "voice," "testimony," and "speech" (Giancarlo *Mirrour* 459). While there are similarities with other demonic parliaments, Gower does not use the term parliament, and so is not discussed here.

This demonizes the idea of the devils' collective and Parliament. While *ÞDP* presents these ideas in 1430, almost thirty years later "The parliament assembled by Henry VI at Coventry, in 1459, was called the Devil's Parliament" (Rudwin, "Pandemonium" 469). I argue that the adversarial nature of Parliament and its construction as demonic is a commonly held belief given that *ÞDP* was not a widely circulated or read text during this time.[60] It was also this Parliament that confirmed the absolute nature of royal power and clearly defined treason. We will see a similar characterization in Chapter Four with Milton's presentation of infernal councils in *Paradise Lost.* History reveals there was precedent for characterizing Parliament as demonic for the ways it countered the divine rights of kings. As we saw in the table of named Parliaments, Parliament's adversarial nature contributes to its construction as a demonic structure. Henry IV (1399-1413) struggled to unify England while fighting with Parliament and "was subjected to unprecedented challenges and restrictions emanating from the Commons" (Giancarlo, *Parliament* 218). The opening stanza of *ÞDP*, "Alle the deuelys off eyre and hell / Made a parlement" (All the devils of air and hell made a parliament, lines 3-4)[61] ensures that the ideals of Parliament, democracy, and the demonic are linked. Later, demonizing the democratic Parliament becomes a popular rhetorical move in pamphlets of the seventeenth century during the Restoration.

---

[60] The text does not gain popularity until Wynken de Worde's printing in 1509 as a response to Henry VII's death. In fact, many scholars mistakenly credit de Worde as the author even though the author is unknown. It became available to more modern scholars with the 1877 reprinting by the Early English Text Society.

[61] While the A-text uses "Made" the B-text uses "Helden" (held). Marx notes that the B-test "distorts the thematic and doctrinal integrity of the original" (*Rights and the Redemption* 126). Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

Within the poem, the structure and organization of hell is the inverse of heaven, with slippage between the descriptions of the physical and political structures of hell. Each infernal institution is copied from a corresponding divine establishment. The diabolical monarchy was founded in opposition to the celestial kingdom as an “imitation” (Rudwin, *The Devil* 123). This focus on structures, such as monarchy and Parliament, suggests that any structure that seeks to copy to replace God’s is inherently demonic. It is the voices of the lesser devils, the actual parliament, that is given the most focus and space in the text. “Democratic freedom of speech and discussion prevails at the infernal council,” as the devils represent “the spirit of revolt in men and the instigator of all social and political upheavals on earth” (Rudwin, *The Devil* 81, 264). It is impossible to separate rebellion from the diabolical as we will see in Chapter Three. The devil’s function is to alienate and separate people “from the self as much as from the community” (Giancarlo, *Parliament* 455). His adversarial nature makes him an easy figure to define community and nation against. If you join and define yourself through participation in a cohesive community, you are not demonic. The devils are not described as individuals but a collective. This makes their rebellion a large scale political act, not a personal one. Rebellion is the “degradation of the body politic” (Giancarlo *Parliament* 456), tainting and fracturing the entire people paradoxically started by a perverted body politic. This connects the body politic with rebellion and politics. *ÞDP* is historically bookended by rebellion, with the Peasant’s Revolt on one side and Jack Cade’s rebellion against the English government in 1450 on the other. Cade’s rebellion, his popularity with the people, can be read back onto *ÞDP*’s association with devils, Parliament, and rebellion. We will see this connection between rebellion and the diabolical again in the

characterization of Owain Glyndŵr (Glendower) in *1 Henry IV* (1598), and Macbeth (1606) in Chapter Three, and again with Satan in *Paradise Lost* in Chapter Four.

The Democratic Collective as Demonic

Part of what differentiates *Þe Deulis Perlament* from other infernal councils, is the demonizing of the people (devils) and their speech as well as the political structures they build and participate in, an idea revisited and revised in Chapter Four with *Paradise Lost*. Parliament is demonic because its members are not divine and they give equal legitimacy to the various voices of the devil, master devil, Sathan, Lucyfer, and Belsabub. Each voice is given the chance to speak and each opinion is considered. In *ÞDP* the word choice of "parliament" versus "council" further supports this. Parliament represents the voices of the people, and its members listen to the people when they come before them with petitions. Their function is inherently democratic and therefore is inherently demonic. They have a voice and the power to act versus "councils" which can only advise, not act themselves. A Parliament of devils transforms the voice and representatives of the people into a potentially rebellious voice of change.

The opening stanza of *Þe Deulis Perlament* reveals that the purpose of the devil's Parliament is to inquire about the birth and presence of Jesus Christ, and determine how to react. He is the reason that they have come together and formed their Parliament:

Whan Marye was gret with Gabryel,

Hadde conseyued and born a chylde,

Alle the deuelys off eyre and helle

Made a parlement of that mayden mylde,

Wha[t] man had made here wombe to swelle:

> ‘To temptyn hyr ȝe tent to selde;
>
> The shyldys fadyr who can telle,
>
> He dude with here the werkys wylde? (lines 1-8)

The inciting incident for the formation of the Parliament of devils is Mary’s pregnancy and the birth of a child (line 2). While the larger purpose is to act against divine authority and identify ways to gain power. The initial subject of their Parliament is “that maiden mild” (line 4) and uncovering who got her pregnant (line 5). The devils plan to tempt her into betraying the father. The opening is presented as a puzzle or riddle the devils cannot figure out rather than as a doctrinal problem. The importance of Christ’s paternity is raised and quickly discarded, refocusing the poem on the devils and not Christ, a departure from Harrowing narratives. The opening stanza reveals the devils’ misunderstanding of Christ while highlighting their own importance. Thus, the poem has two contradictory lessons: the voices of the devil (the people) are important but their acts of mimesis and attempts at creation are doomed to fail.

Demonic Creation as Mimesis

Þe Deulis Perlament does not result in the creation of a new figure; yet, creation imagery is a constant presence in the text. The devils seek to (re)create what they have known—the labor, work, and power structures of heaven—and this mimicry functions in the same way as carnival, reinforcing power structures and norms. Like Baudrillard’s concept of *Simulacra and Simulations*, the Utopia the devils attempt to create in hell only serves to negate the value of what they have created. The devils’ previously unfallen state represents Baudrillard’s first phase where they reflect basic reality. Once they rebel and fall, they represent the second phase which is evil because it masks and perverts the

original. Their attempts to recreate the signs and structures they once knew mark phase three, which masks the absence of an original and phase four where there is no reality, no original, only the simulacrum (Lodge and Wood 423). Eventually the devils present themselves as self-sufficient but the world they are self-sufficient in is unreal.

Like many devil figures in English literature the devils and their creations are paradoxical. Their creations, their structures, are not real, but their voices, their speech, their rhetoric, their narratives, are presented as real threats that cannot be ignored. The devils as a collective seek the signs and symbols of power without understanding the real meaning and significance behind these images (Lodge and Wood 428). This imitation characterizes all structures that counter and attempt to replace God as demonic. If national identity is formed by a "complex of common ideas" (De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak 153), then this demonic collective mocks that identity. While the demons are complex, act as a unit, and construct a single identity, their construction is artificial, the simulacrum, not the real. Nations are "mental constructs" that exist in the minds of its people (De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak 153), constructed through language, a complex set of ideas, formed against difference, and the devils mimic these systems, these constructs. What makes these councils demonic is their parliamentary nature, their representation of numerous and varied voices, and their mimicry of the real. Out of *ÞDP's* fifty-five stanzas, thirty-two focus on the dialogue amongst the devils, Christ's speech is only featured in eleven, Christ's birth in three, and his resurrection in four. God only appears in four, and the Holy Ghost in one.

Within the text, the variety of devils and their voices, their collective nature, is emphasized. While Malmesbury used various terms for the devil interchangeably *ÞDP*

uses a hierarchy for the devils with their names highlighting the diversity of voices that have joined together to form this collective.

Term	Lines it appears in
Deuels	lines 109, 129, 141, 145, 262[62]
legyoun of deuelys	line 183
Mayster deuyl	lines 89, 105
Alle the deuelys	line 4
Fendys	line 97[63]
All the fyndys	line 49
Parlement	line 5
Sathan[64]	line 137[65]
Lucyfer[66]	lines 281, 289, 297, 353[67]

Table 3: Terms Used to Describe Devil and Fallen Devils in Þe Deulis Perlament

The numerous appearances of "devils" emphasizes the power of the collective while Lucyfer and "Master Deuyl" highlight the power hierarchy as does the use of "legyoun," "alle," and "all." Within *Þe Deulis Perlament*, Rudwin argues that Satan is presented as

[62] Unless otherwise noted, my citations refer to the A-text because it is the original text from London BL MS Add. 37492 versus the longer B version which appears in the mid-15th century Lambeth Palace Library MS 853 and is notably published by Wynken de Worde in 1509.
[63] Fiends are also referred to by the variations of "fyndys," (line 49), "fend" (line 65), "fynde" (lines 33, 280, 351, 425, 433, 441) with no explanation for the differences as the characters described are not presented as different within the text.
[64] Satan is also identified as Beelzebub, "prince of demons" in the Gospels.
[65] Variations within the text include "fowle Sathan" (line 171).
[66] Tradition states that Lucifer was Satan's original name, before the fall.
[67] The B-text has additional mentions of "Lucifer" (lines 305, 321, 329) and "Sathan" (line 313).

"the head of the hierarchy of hell," despite Beelzebub traditionally understood as the devil who "headed a revolution against the ancient leader of the rebel angels and wrested the crown and scepter from him" (Rudwin, "Pandemonium" 464) and Lucyfer mentioned more often. This choice stresses the collective struggle not the concept of rebellion. Within *ÞDP*, there is no evidence of that conflict between the two; they are simply part of the variation of voices. In addition to featuring devils, Satan, and Lucifer, and "Belsabub" (line 369), the poem presents "Helle" as a personified figure (lines 353, 368). Within the poem, these figures are presented inside a specific hierarchy with devils and fiends at the bottom, Satan above them, Lucifer at the top, and Hell and Belsabub presented as close to or equal to Lucifer. The hierarchy of these demonic characters, the spatial setting of hell itself (the place, not the personified figure that makes an appearance at the end of the poem), and the emphasis on parliament as a structure all reinforces the poem's focus on structures. The poem itself does not privilege any voice above the other. These various structures are all revisited at the end of the poem. The last stanza begins, "Here endyth the Fendys Parlement" (line 433), stressing the structure of parliament itself, linking it to the physical structure—"helle prison" (line 440)—then ending with the political structure: "Here ys wryten the Fendys Parlement" (line 441). Political and hierarchal structures frame the poem but they do not restrict it.

Even though the devils rebelled against God's authority and the hierarchy of heaven, once they are fallen they recreate the same structures they rebelled against. They are incapable of creating new things as true creation is limited to the divine, so they can only mimic what they already know: "The infernal government was patterned after the celestial government" (Rudwin, "Pandemonium" 463). Even the devils' transformation

from angel to fallen is not a result of their power, but punishment from God. The devils are transformed from angels into the fallen, the inverse of their initial state. This new state defines itself by what it is not, no longer angelic, no longer in heaven. As we will see in *Paradise Lost,* the fallen are transformed again at the end of the epic with their exterior shapes becoming a punishment. As Baudrillard echoes, "Everything is metamorphosed into its inverse in order to be perpetuated in its purged form. Every form of power, every situation speaks of itself by denial, to attempt to escape" (180). These changes serve as visual warnings of the dangers these devils represent. This visual rhetoric serves the same purpose as common understandings of the devil did, to mark them as different, and therefore a threat.

The devil is connected to creation in the medieval mind through more than just mimesis. The *N-Town Plays* has "Creation and the Fall of Lucifer" as the first play followed by "Creation of the World and the Fall of Man." God's creation of the world and man is linked to the creation of the devil through his fall as though one action required the other. It is Satan's envy over the creation of man that precipitates his fall and transformation into Lucifer. This connection may explain why the Devil feels the need to mimic the structures of heaven and attempt creation on his own to regain what he has lost and to try and outdo God's creation of man. Within *Þe Deulis Perlament* none of the devils create anything, not an item, physical structure, or figure despite numerous references to making, work, and creation imagery. In Robert de Boron and the *Prose Merlin*, the French source material for the Merlin narratives, it is a "counseill" of devils and they "assembleden togedir" (line 3) for the express purpose of creating Merlin (lines 47-50); therefore, the lack of creation, of power, is a uniquely English element. In

contrast to the fertile French narrative, the devils of *ÞDP* are sterile, impotent, and ultimately powerless. We can read impotence as a critique on the structure of Parliament itself, unable to create or get the work done that they are meant to do. This is certainly true later with Henry VI's parliament, but we will see it again with James I's battles in the seventeenth-century when Parliament blocks his attempts at creating a unified Britain, not just incapable of creating but actively blocking creation.

The devils' intention to mimic Godly creation is evident from the beginning with the word choice, "Made a parlement" (line 4) and is reinforced throughout the opening stanzas. The mention of "werkys" (works, line 8)[68] invokes creation through an object created and the labor involved in this creation. The devils' (false) attempts at creation first appear privileged over God's creation because his creations are not mentioned until line 73, "Thoȝw God maken hys parlement" and when it is mentioned it is in the context of the devils. The devils tell the audience about God, and they are the narrative voice, not God. The fiends say that:

> Thoȝw God maken hys parlement
>
> With Pees, Mercye, Trouthe and Reson,
>
> From heuene to erthe thow hys sone be sent
>
> In mankynde to makyn a seson,
>
> Ordeyne we be on asent
>
> A newe consayl alle of treson
>
> To claymen Ihesu fore oure rent;

---

[68] The *OED* lists the first occurrence of "work" in English is Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* (ca.1000), "þæt wæorc wæs begunnen ongein godes willan" (that work was begun against God's will). "Work" in this case means action, labor, deeds done.

He ys kynde of man, it ys gode cheson.

[Then God made his parliament

With Peace, Mercy, Truth and Reason,

From heaven to earth he sent his son

To mankind to make a season

We ordained to be sent

A new council full of treason

To claim Jesus for our own work

He is a kind of man, God's chosen.] (lines 73-80)

This stanza emphasizes the differences between God's actual creation and the devils' false attempts at creation by focusing on process. The devils only state they "Made a parlement," while God's creation provides details as to how he created, with "Peace, Mercy, Truth and Reason;" he makes Jesus, and then sends him to earth to make a difference. This next stanza depicts Jesus as a "strange syde / In Adames grounde he ys sowyn" [strange seed / In Adam's ground he is sown] (lines 83-84). The use of "strange" here reinforces the devils' misunderstanding of who Jesus in and acknowledges that Jesus's conception was unusual. "Syde" also illustrates the fertility of true creation. Both this line, and the passages above credit God alone with creation, erasing Mary from the process, a way of reinforcing the patriarchal natural order within the text. Other planting and creation imagery include "Whanne he ys rype" [when he is ripe, when he is ready] (line 85), and the devils being about to "repe" [reap] (line 86) him. The stanza after restates the devils' purpose in all of this, to "maken of hym bothe fole and nys / And in helle hys soule brede" [to make him (Jesus) both fool and [what he] is not / And in hell

his soul roast] (lines 95-96). The devils do not believe Jesus is God's divine son so they think he and his soul belongs to them in hell for them to torture just like any other man's soul. This is their true work, their only job, their purpose to "maken of hyme." The irony of course is that this work is ultimately part of God's plan and structure, it cannot operate on its own.

The devils' recreation of heaven's work may account for the presence of the different types of devils in the text and the earthly imagery of farming and work within the poem. Within hell, "each craft and class among men has a special representative among the infernal spirits" (Rudwin, "Pandemonium" 471), which illustrates that "A specialization and division of labor seems to exist in hell" (Rudwin, "Pandemonium" 472). The seed references could also apply to the conception of Jesus. Given the mimicry of heaven, these different labor divisions can be read as the devils' version of the specific jobs angels are assigned. In hell, each devil has a specific job, often defined by his own personal vices, the mirror inverse of the virtues their angelic selves possessed. This also connects to the Old English meaning of "craft" as "Skill, skillfulness, art; ability in planning or performing, ingenuity in constructing, dexterity" (*OED*) and the idea that "craftiness" is a demonic trait, since Old English texts. Yet while they labor, they cannot create and what they think they create is not considered work. They mimic and attempt to (re)create but it is not real. While the jobs in *ÞDP* are described as labor and work, it is not the same as the labor and work they did in heaven or performed by Jesus Christ. The text's use of "werk" invokes this difference. *The Middle English Dictionary* defines "werk" as pain, but also as "(one's) individual acts, deeds, or actions, the things one does or has done in one's life" (b) that can either be "a morally commendable act," (c) or a

"demonstration of wickedness, misbehavior, wrongdoing" (c). Therefore, the word itself does not have any innately good or innately evil connotations itself so the meaning must be read in the context. Works done by Christ are good and true while the work done by the devils is a perversion, a corruption.

Within the poem, the acts of work, creation, and craft are further connected by the dialogue of the devils and Jesus. When Jesus rebuffs Satan, the devils respond and connect these three ideas of "werk," God's creation, and "craftys":

> In werk he ys God, in persone he ys man;
> Lyke to hym Y neuer knewe;
> Where leryd he all the craftys he can?
> Eche day he dothe wondrys newe.
> [In work he is God, in person he is a man;
> The like of him I never knew;
> Where did he learn all the crafts he can do?
> Each day he does new wonders.] (lines 173-76)

Jesus's works, his deeds are wonders, terms never applied to the works of the devils. Wonders are only used to describe divine acts. Jesus is associated with "wondrys" in lines 9, 214, 176, 186, 238, "song of wondrys" in line 328, and his "wondyrful assencioun" in line 438, just before the end of the poem. Wonder is often connected to marvels or curiosities, strange, unfamiliar, and unknowable items. The devils' attempts at creation cannot be real and, therefore cannot be wondrous. Jesus is associated with the notion of conception as making in lines 76, 95, and 182, far outweighing the one instance of the devils making their Parliament. Furthermore, divine creation and knowledge is

connected to words and speech: the prophets "spekyn" (line 57) and people "spekyn" of Christ to spread word of his presence (line 59). This is contrasted with the devils who are only associated with "speke" when they interrogate Jesus on how he can be God's son (line 110). Yet part of what makes the Parliament demonic is the focus on their voices, their dialogue, their speech. The devils find Jesus's words offensive, "Thy wordys ar bytter, thy werkes sour" [Your words are bitter; your works are sour] (line 142). This passage contrasts the true word of God with the false words of the devil, later a key element of the devil with his association with deception through speech and equivocation as we will see in Chapter Three and Four.

These interactions stress the contrasts between the devils as pale imitators and Christ as the real thing. Yet even here, *ÞDP* represents a contradiction. Christ's words are presented as true creation, but the narrator of *Þe Deulis Perlament* is a collective of demons telling their side of the story. This act of storytelling, this simulation, this attempt to create the real and not the copy, is in and of itself an act of creation. The dramatic and oral nature of their narrative is creation even if it is ephemeral, not material, creation. The act of narrating creates a relationship between the devils and the reader/audience. The first-person narration of the devils paradoxically authenticates their story to the other devils and emphasizes to the audience just how much the devils misunderstand the true nature of Jesus (Marx, *The Devil as Narrator* 71). While I argue that the text privileges the stories of the devils, it also presents their narratives as inherently dangerous, "what makes *The Devil's Parliament* distinctive is the way in which it fully and self-consciously develops the strategy of casting the Devil in the role of narrator of the life of Christ" (*The Devil as Narrator* 73). Religious doctrines as presented or interpreted by the

devil are dangerous. While the narrative is created, and therefore is real, and true as the devils see it, the devils turn out to be "unreliable narrators" (Silber 226). Marx argues that "The Devil is a narrator who fails to understand the significance of what he is relating and becomes the victim of his own plot" (*The Devil as Narrator* 75) and this inability to understand Christ is one of the elements that sets the devils apart. Even in his speech, the devil cannot present the "real." The idea of telling a story as creation and the idea of the devils as unreliable narrators are concepts later seen with Satan in *Paradise Lost.*

The devils' speech in *Þe Deulis Perlament* is dangerous because their narrative attempts to alter reality, their speech results in actions, and because it represents the voice of the people, the devils' collective. However, their speech is not association with the demonic equivocation as we'll see in Chapter Three and Four. The speech of the demons in *ÞDP* deceives no one but themselves. There is no larger scheme, no rebellion, no actions on a national scale. They are simply wrong, they are not duplicitous. In fact, their dialogue reveals that they truly believe what they say, every word, every incarnation of devil. There is no one devil figure seeking to deceive another, there is no logical fallacy in their speech, there is no larger goal. This shift in how demonic speech is shown, from *Þe Deulis Perlament* in 1430 to equivocation as demonic speech at the end of fifteenth century and into the early modern period indicates an emerging anxiety and fear during this time that is oriented around speech.

The lessons of *Þe Deulis Perlament* are both secular and religious. The devil figures of the fendys, Mayster deuyl, Sathan, Lucyfer, Helle, and Belsabub create demonic structures that mimic heavenly ones, as they both counter and are subsumed within the framework of God's plan. While the devils think they are countering these

authorities, the lesson of the devil's Parliament demonstrates that they simply reinforce the original power structures:

> . . . the Devil is one who exists within a framework of social structure in which the capacity for disruption is less, because of the overriding power of the king; the Devil has no 'right of possession.' The new analogy implies that evil consists of crimes against both the state and the individual, and a greater sense of confidence in society and its ability to maintain order—evil can be overthrown. (Marx, *Rights and the Redemption* 26)

Þe Deulis Perlament, focuses on the structures; of Parliament, the physical structures and the structures of mimesis, the form the demonic collective, and the structure of the dramatic as seen in the dialogue and exchanges between Christ and the devils. We can analyze the form of dialogue as habitus, social process patterns that are then transferred from one situation to another. Dialogue between Christ and the devils present Christian teachings in a pattern, as they do in Harrowing narratives. The dialogues in *ÞDP* do not function this way as the emphasis is on the devils, not Christ. The word of God, of creation, and dialogue as instruction moves from heaven to hell, from God to the devils. The devils were part of a celestial council in heaven, so they replicate this council in hell. Yet the structure they choose is not a council, but is specifically named Parliament. Just as their structures of Parliament, dialogue, and power are not true creations, so too they do not learn any lessons from the mimesis (Aristotle, *Poetics* Part IV). Because they lack both man's ability to repent and learn, and God's ability to create, they are incapable of learning from their actions.

While the devils are inept at learning from their actions, the reader is not. The devils stand in for the reader, exposed to and educated on the truths of Christ throughout the poem. The devils' ignorance ensures that their mission "To temptyn" Jesus (line 153) will not succeed, which is the ultimate lesson to the reader. The reader knows Jesus is divine and therefore cannot be tempted or led astray by devils, but the devils do not grasp that. The dialogue between Jesus and the devils, Satan, and Lucifer illustrates similar lessons as the Harrowing, the undeniable power of the divine, and how to avoid evil. The devils do not understand that while Jesus appears in the form of a man, they will not be able to "tempte hym in wrathe or pride" [tempt him to anger and pride] (line 161) as they can other men. He is not susceptible to the sins and vices of mankind. The opening of the poem states why the devils formed their Parliament—to tempt Jesus, attempt to discover if he is indeed human and therefore tainted, and within their domain. However, the dialogue of the poem reveals the lessons of Jesus's divinity and how the devils will never be able to understand the divine. The devils try several times to tempt Jesus, and after each failure they express puzzlement on how he could resist them. Individual devils, the legion of devils, Lucifer, and Satan are all unsuccessful as a collective in accomplishing their stated goals.

This journey of (not) gaining knowledge presents to the audience, through the demonic figures, the lesson of the poem, that the devils are powerless to counter God's plan and God's creation. We can also read in this a civics lesson on English national identity, that the uneducated voices of a democratic collective are dangerous, and ultimately end badly. The ultimate lesson of *Þe Deulis Perlament* is clear to the reader/audience even if it is never clear to the devils themselves. The contradictions are

never resolved but simply ignored. As in “Play 23,” *ÞDP*’s devils discuss and debate but never move forward to action. Merlin variations of infernal councils, however, are completely dependent on the council moving through all of Cool’s elements. The devils must move from discussion to action for Merlin to exist. As such Merlin texts have a focus on physical creation not seen in English presentations of infernal councils. Their purposes are the opposite, while *ÞDP* seeks to disrupt natural order, they are unclear on how to do so, and can only mimic and fail at creation. Merlin narratives, on the other hand, have creation as their clear goal and are successful in meeting it.

Only the English Demonize Parliament

One way to discern the specifically political nature of English devils and how English authors grappled with the idea of a demonic, democratic collective is to analyze them against similar scenes in French source material. First, the *Prose Merlin* makes only one reference to political structures, the “counseill” and while *Prose Merlin* has a hierarchy of devil figures and the structure of a council, their purpose is not explicitly political although they are concerned with issues of power and representation. In *Prose Merlin*, it is “the Devell” (line 1) who is in charge and generic “fendes” who form the council; “the fendes helden a gret counseill” (line 32). These devils do not make or create a council, they hold it. The only creation in *Prose Merlin* is the creation of Merlin and then England through Merlin’s actions. The creation of Merlin and not the council is the devils’ “work” (“werkis,” line 20). In *Prose Merlin*, the devils are concerned that Jesus, as a human man, should have been theirs, and they are concerned with the amount of power Jesus wields, potentially over them and hell; “he putt down oure power” (line 20). However, rather than try and tempt him, the devils instead decide to create their own

figure who will counter Christ and act for their interests on Earth.[69] Merlin will be "a man of oure kyne that myght speke and have oure connynge and [maystrie] worke" [a man of our kind that might speak [for us] and have our cunning [a great accomplishment, a notable work] (lines 36-38). An unnamed fiend who claims he can impregnate women offers to act, "I have power to sowe seede in woman and make her conceyve" (lines 47-48), so he can accomplish the creation of one of their own. The council ends with the fiend leaving hell, going to Earth, and deceiving and seducing Merlin's mother.[70] The creation in *Prose Merlin* is the creation of Merlin, a demon who can pass as a man and work their evil deeds on Earth. Their creation is demonic but real, not an imitation. This differentiates it from the other infernal councils that depend wholly on simulacra. Even though their creation is not an imitation, it is still doomed to fail as *Prose Merlin* is ultimately a conversion narrative. Merlin chooses to use his demonically gifted powers for God, and for the good of England, ensuring the success of Arthur's kingship. The *Prose Merlin* combines the nationalistic purpose of devilish figures in Malmesbury with

---

[69] The role and purpose is what we could recognize as the anti-Christ, although this is not a term used in the text.

[70] In Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* (1136) Merlin's father is not named as a devil, his mother simply says "there appeared to me a person in the shape of a most beautiful young man." (Rollins CHAP. XVIII). Thomas Heywood's *The Life of Merlin: Surnamed Ambrosius* (1641) says Merlin "was conceived by the compression of a fantastical spiritual creature, without a body" (40) who is later named as a "Dæmon" (40). Other Merlin narratives such as *Robert the Devil* (13th century), *Sir Gowther* (1475), and Rowley's *The Birth of Merlin* (1662) specifically name Merlin's father as demonic. These narratives present Merlin's tale as a conversion narrative, highlighting that fact that even the son of a/the devil can be made to work towards God's interests. This conversion narrative is then intertwined with and becomes indistinguishable from the nationalistic narrative of Arthurian legend. For further information, see Anita Obermeier's 2014 article "Merlin's Conception by Devil in William Rowley's Play *the Birth of Merlin."*

the lessons to be gained from the presentation of demonic structures in *Þe Deulis Perlament.*

The N-Town Play "Play 23 Parliament of Hell: Temptation" emphasizes the devils as stand-ins for the audience yet the lesson is not political, unique, or concerned with creation, despite its title.[71] "Play 23" is most closely aligned to Harrowing narratives. Despite the title the devils in the play form a "councel" (line 2), not a parliament and we get a compressed hierarchy that only consists of "Sathan" (line 1) who is "oure sovereyne sire" (line 5) and only Belyard and Belzabub participate in the dialogue. In "Play 23" the devils are concerned with the amount of power Jesus wields, potentially over them and hell; "He syll be lorde over hevyn and helle" (line 36). While "Play 23" references "werke" (line 30), there is no creation in the play the only creation is the divine creation of Jesus which the devils debate. In "Play 23," the action may begin with the devils but it quickly conforms to Harrowing narratives with their focus on Christ and his role as redeemer. Even when the devils say they will "tempte in synnes" (line 50), the focus is on Christ as the object of their tempting. In the *N-Town Play* the devils are portrayed comically with their ignorance portrayed, watering down the serious lessons meant to be gained from infernal councils. Carnival can be seen in both the comedic nature of the devils and their inversions of heavenly figures and structures. The devils represent an inversion of power that ultimately serves to reinforce authority (Yaneva 58): "The devil is a bogeyman contrived to compel obedience and subordination" (101). The audience can laugh at the devils' behavior, then dismiss them and the danger they represent. While

[71] We must use caution when making statements about titles, of plays, and manuscripts, given the influence of editors.

"Play 23" does not demonize parliament or the democratic voices it represents, two hundred years later the idea that demonic structures only reinforce divine ones is revisited and revised as will be seen in Chapter Four.

While *A Song Called Þe Deulis Perlament, OR Parlamentum of Feendis* shares many traits with other infernal councils in literature, the emphasis on political structures, its focus on the false creation of these structures, and the construction of the democratic collective as demonic, counter the normative narrative, and make the text unique. Christ and his lessons are not the focus but an after-thought. The presentation of the devils is complicated and contradictory, not the simple presentation one would expect in a text with a didactic purpose. *Þe Deulis Perlament* ends with a sympathetic presentation of the devils that is at odds with the larger lessons of the poem. This demonic Parliament represents varied voices but they are not to be emulated or held up as role models. They are a democratic structure that represents the people but this structure, its speech, is a potential threat to divine and secular authority. This offers conflicting views of how we are meant to see *Þe Deulis Perlament* and the devils Parliament within it. We will see these conflicting lessons again in Chapter Four with *Paradise Lost* but first, we return to the idea of devilish leaders in the form of internal diabolic rebels who pose threats to English authority in the form of the monarchy in Chapter Three.

Chapter Three: Diabolical Rebellions

in *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth*

The devil is defined first and foremost by his rebellion, his initial actions against God which lead to the fall, and the beginning of the devil's adversarial actions against God and mankind. The devil's rebellion counters the natural order because it counters God. It is evil because it leads other angels astray, and after the fall, the temptation of mankind becomes the *raison d'etre* for the devil and his minions. Rebellion does not just affect an individual, but the collective, the nation. Rebellion is often framed as a greater threat because it is not an external altern who threatens core values and people but an internal one. Rebels can hide in plain sight, they could be anyone. The common understanding of the devil as we saw in the Introduction is that he is an ethnically and visually different altern who tempts, deceives, and seduces to persuade mankind to reject God, as the devil once did. This devil is often associated with other marginalized groups who are characterized as alterns; women, Jews, Moors, as well as the Welsh, Irish, and Scottish. Several Shakespeare plays conform to this understanding, even if his plays only include human figures described as devils, not actual devil figures. Richard in *Richard III*

(1591/1597),[72] Joan of Arc from *1 Henry VI* (1592/1623),[73] Aaron from *Titus Andronicus* (1594),[74] Shylock from *The Merchant of Venice* (1598),[75] and Caliban[76] with his

---

[72] Richard in *Richard* III (1591/1597) is constructed as demonic because he is monstrous; it is his visual difference, his physical deformity that initially marks him as demonic (Coe 33), and his demonic nature makes his demonic actions inevitable. This is in line with other portrayals of monstrous births, prodigies, and children this period, who are described against nature and were frequently understood as products of the devil. Others certainly recognize and name Richard as a devil; Lady Anne asks "What black magician conjures up this fiend" (1.2.34) and Queen Margaret categorizes him as a "devil" (1.3.296). He is also described as a "son of hell" (1.3.227). Yet under our definitions that equate ethnic difference with the demonic, Richard does not fit. He acts out of his own self-interests and petty jealousies not for nationalistic interests.

[73] Joan of Arc *from 1 Henry VI* (1592/1623) is accused of being demonic because she is a cross-dressing woman who wields magic and is French. On the surface it would seem that her Frenchness is the main cultural, ethnic marker of differences, and therefore the demonic. Yet within the confines of the play it is her gender, the way that she counters norms, and her magic that constructs her demonic nature. She is named a devil by men because she counters patriarchal norms and transgresses gendered power norms. John Talbot links demonically associated character traits and acts such as "treason" (3.4.1), "Pucelle," "witch," "sorceress" (3.4.3), "hellish mischief" (3.4.4) and "pride" (3.4.5) to Joan. He goes on to identify her as a "Foul fiend of France, and hag" (3.5.12). He also describes her as "Devil a devil's dam" (1.7.5), "witch" (1.7.6, 21) and associates her with "hell" (1.7.9). She is demonic for her associations with witchcraft, cross-dressing, and for the ways she counters norms.

[74] Aaron from *Titus Andronicus* (1594) is a devil because of his racialized and sexualized body, a portrayal that builds on medieval concepts of darkness as evidence of sin and evil. His difference is a cultural and ethnic one. Yet while blackness is often constructed as demonic, Aaron is most often described as "Aaron the Moor," a fact that presents a challenge as Moors are not described as devils in English literature. Aaron also does not act as culturally or ethnically different, defined only through his own acts and his relationship with Tamora, not described through any other lens. Aaron is named as a devil in Act 4 and later his child with Tamara is named by the Nurse as "a devil" (4.2.62-64). Aaron is also described as "hellish dog" (4.2.77) a "fiend" (4.2.78 and 5.1.45), and "the incarnate devil" (5.1.40). Aaron's blackness is a physical mark of his sin, his inherently evil nature and this physicality, his race and sexualized body, are as much a mark of the devil as his evil actions are.

[75] Shylock from *The Merchant of Venice* (1598) continues a long tradition of associating Jews with the devil.[75] Shylock is also named as a devil by others because he is a Jew[75] and a moneylender; "The devil can cite Scripture" (1.3.98), he is a "kind of devil" (2.2.24), described as a "fiend" (2.2.21), and the "very devil incarnate" (2.2.27). Shylock, like Joan, does not see himself as a devil but is constructed as such by others. While Shylock's main descriptor is as a Jew, all that is presented is the stereotypical beliefs of

monstrous and deformed shape in *The Tempest,* all conform to this common understanding of the English devil. This dissertation is not focused on devil figures that conform to the common understanding but rather ones that counter it, and in the case of Shakespeare that does not mean these figures but the figures Hotspur in *1 Henry IV* (1596-7/1598) and Macbeth (1606/1623) who are constructed as demonic because of their political rebellions, their betrayals of their kings/lords, the ways they use speech to achieve their demonic actions, and the heroes who challenge them and restore the natural order. In Chapters One and Two the political English devil figures were easily discernable. They were either marked by actual devils, as with Ceolred in *Gesta,* or they were devils themselves as in *Þe Deulis Perlament.* In the early modern period, there is more slippage in determining who the devils are. Both Hotspur and Macbeth are surrounded by figures who are more in line with portrayals of the commonly understood devil, although not all of them serve political purposes.

Many of Shakespeare's plays feature political rebellion: all three of the *Henry VI* plays (1592/1594),[77] the rebellion of the earls at the end of *Richard II* (1595/1623),

---

others, not how he sees himself, or defines himself through culture or ethnicity, and no political element so we don't have quite the same context as we do with the Welsh, Scots, and Irish.

[76] Like the demonic parentage in medieval Merlin narratives, Caliban is demonic because his father was, as Caliban was "got by the devil himself" (1.2.323). Caliban is ethnically and culturally different in that he is primitive, savage, more tribal, when contrasted with Prospero and Miranda. Yet, he is just not them, not Anglo. Caliban has no culture of his own, in large part because his mother, who might have instructed him in their home culture, was killed. He is potentially ethnically different, with Sycorax's home given as Algiers. Yet while colonial and post-colonial race theory often reads this personal rebellion as representing larger national and global issues, Caliban's own rebellion is a personal one, never reaching a larger scale. For more on this see Dean Ebner's 1965 article "The Tempest: Rebellion and the Ideal State."

[77] Date performed/Date published

Richard III (1633/1623), and *King John* (1596-7/1623) feature rebellions against the king; both *Julius Caesar* (1599/1623) and *Coriolanus* (1609/1623) contain military uprisings; Caliban rebels against Prospero's enslavement in *The Tempest* (1610-11/1623) and encourages a class rebellion amongst the servants. *Troilus and Cressida* (1609)[78] is more focused on romance than political or martial rebellion, but because of the background of the Trojan War, many still read rebellion onto it. In each of these plays political rebellion is presented as a threat against the natural and divine order.[79]

In addition to the plays which feature non-demonized political rebellion, other plays are read through the lens of rebellion. For example, *2 Henry VI* can be read through both the Cade Rebellion of 1450 when the play is set and the political risings that occurred under the reign of Queen Elizabeth I when the play was written. Jack Cade's rebellion was concerned with corruption and Henry VI's abuse of power in court, and as we saw in Chapter Two, his issues in Parliament. Elizabeth's reign included concerns of the working class, out of work soldiers from the conflicts in Ireland with no clear place in the country, and court intrigue, all issues that contributed to the Essex Rebellion.[80] Some scholars read Shakespeare's portrayal of "unruly women,"[81] as rebels against patriarchal

---

[78] There is no proof that *Troilus and Cressida* was performed during Shakespeare's time.
[79] Naseeb Shaheen's 1999 *Biblical References in Shakespeare's Play* makes rebellion against the monarchy a rebellion against the natural law and order of God, arguing that political rebellion has universal consequences.
[80] Pauline Kiernan's 2016 article "The Art of Political Rebellion on Shakespeare's Stage" contextualizes many of these issues.
[81] Shakespeare's Unruly Women, part of the Exhibitions at the Folger, opened on February 18, 1997, and closed on August 9, 1997. Katherine from *Taming of the Shrew* (1594), Rosalind from *As You Like It* (1603/1623), Viola and Olivia from *Twelfth Night* (1602/1623), Cleopatra from *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606-7/1623), and Lady Macbeth from *Macbeth* (1606/1623) are all considered "unruly women."

authority; their rebellions, however, are more domestic than national or political, and except for Lady Macbeth,[82] these women are not demonized, so they are not included here.

The rebellions of Hotspur in *1 Henry IV* (1596-7/1598) and *Macbeth* play out in personal and national ways, combining rebellion with demonic antagonists. Owain Glendower and Macbeth also counter commonly accepted narratives about Welsh and Scots as demonic alterns. They are constructed as demonic for their rebellion, not their nationality. At first glance, it would appear that the devil in *1 Henry IV* is Glendower. Historically the Welsh were seen as barbaric, savage, ethnically different alterns since Edward I's political and martial campaigns in 1277-1283 and the nationalistic propaganda that accompanied these events. Yet "The influx of Welsh into England during the late sixteenth century made London 'the largest Welsh city'" (Espinosa and Ruieter 79) the portrayal of the demonically constructed ethnic difference of the Welsh was countered by personal experience. Likewise, James I's ascension to the throne complicates attempts to construct the Scots as ethnically different, demonic alterns who present a threat to England. The audience would have understood that the portrayal of Glendower and Macbeth set in the historical past through the lens of their constructed demonic "Otherness" but they would also have understood that these demonic alterns no longer presented a threat to England. Navigating the political situations at the time of writing, particularly of *Macbeth,* may account in part for the absence of markers of difference in constructing Macbeth as demonic. Since Shakespeare significantly revised

[82] Lady Macbeth is more political than Macbeth, and certainly manipulates. However, while she is often demonized, there are no female devils, and therefore she is not included here, there being a distinction between being demonized and being a devil.

the historical sources to refocus these narratives on rebellion, the more accurate historical lens to read these plays through is the series of rebellions that haunted both the end of Elizabeth I's reign and the beginning of James.' Alicia Marchant's 2014 *The Revolt of Owain Glyndŵr in Medieval English Chronicles* examines the chronicles for their historical and literary importance, as I did in Chapter One with *Gesta regum Anglorum.* In addition, Marchant examines Glyndŵr as a folklore figure, comparing how the Welsh constructed him versus the English, and the political and nationalistic implications of this. She argues that Glyndŵr rebellion was framed by chroniclers as "illegitimate and peripheral" (89), an attempt to rewrite history for nationalistic purposes, as Malmesbury did. Marchant's work provides a template, not only to examine chronicles in a new light, but also in the case of these two Shakespearean plays, how to analyze literary texts that use chronicles as sources.

Treason is defined as betraying one's country, particularly by attempting to kill or overthrow the sovereign. The devil's rebellion did not attempt to kill God, although his rebellion sought to overthrow his order. During the early modern period, I argue that treason and rebellion are closer than we now understand them and that rebellion's political connotation supports this reading. Both the Elizabethan and Jacobean eras were haunted by the idea of rebellion. From the Essex Rebellion in 1591, to the executions of Brian O'Rourke and Sir John Perrot for their treasonous roles[83] in Ireland in 1591 and 1592, Peter Wentworth's imprisonment for bringing up the issue of succession in

---

[83] For more on this see Rebecca Lemon's 2006 *Treason by Words: Literature, Law, and Rebellion in Shakespeare's England,* Karen Cunningham's 2001 *Imaginary Betrayals: Subjectivity and the Discourses of Treason in Early Modern England,* and Ruth Lexton's 2015 "Reading the Adulterous/Treasonous Queen in Early Modern England: Malory's Guinevere and Anne Boleyn."

Parliament in 1593, the Nine Years War/Tyrone's Rebellion (1593-1603), the treason of Roderigo Lopez's attempted poisoning in 1594, and the Oxfordshire Rising over class issues in 1596, the end of Elizabeth's reign resulted in constant challenges to her rule, including uncertainty over succession. During the time of *Macbeth's* initial writing, 1606, the threat of internal trouble and rebellion resurfaces with the Gunpowder Plot, revisiting old anxieties about betrayal, rebellion, and the role of Catholics in these plots. James' reign began on unstable ground, and included internal challenges to his authority, little support from Parliament, and destabilizing forces, all contributing factors to rebellion. During this time, James tried to convince "Parliament to secure a Union of Scotland and England,"[84] the Star Chamber saw a much-reported incident of "faked demonic possession"[85] (Shapiro, *The Year of Lear* 10); plague returned to London in 1603 (Shapiro, *The Year of Lear* 22) and Guy Fawkes's attempts to blow up James and Parliament in 1605.

While both *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth* are mainly constructed as demonic for their focus on rebellions, both also rely heavily on the role speech has in building these rebellions, and key to this is the concept of equivocation. As we saw in Chapter Two, not all demonic speech was seen as equivocation. Equivocation does not have an inherently negative connotation, meaning only "The using (a word) in more than one sense;

---

[84] For more on this see Keith M. Brown's 1992 "The Imperial Experiment 1603-37" and Zachary A. Bates's 2014 "James I and British Identity: The Development of a British Identity from 1542-1689."

[85] For more on the concept of possession during the early modern period see Philip C. Almond's 2004 *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England: Contemporary Texts and Their Cultural Contexts* and Jan Frans van Dijkhuizen's 2007 *Devil Theatre: Demonic Possession and Exorcism in English Renaissance Drama 1558-1642*.

ambiguity or uncertainly of meaning in words" (*OED).* The etymology connects it to "different stages of reasoning" and "having the same name" ("Etymology: equivocation"). The term first appears in the late fourteenth century in Wycliffe's *Sermons*, "Bi þis may we se hou argumentis gone awei bi equivocacion of wordis" [By this may we see how arguments gone awry by (the) equivocation of words] (*OED).* There is no demonic influence here, instead, falling in line with most of the medieval understanding of equivocation throughout the medieval period, associated with logic and philosophy. However, by 1475, the connotation of deception seems commonly accepted (*OED)* and the Middle English Dictionary associates "equivocacioun" with "decepcioun" as lie, and "knak" as an act of equivocation understood to be a trick. Duality of meaning, and an intent to deceive are the focus in these meanings, most popular at the end of the fifteenth century. By the early modern period, Jesuits were most often associated with equivocation, again, not inherently demonic, their ambiguity of answers could be seen as a form of *midrash,* yet it was often constructed as duplicity by those who sought straight answers from them. During the end of Elizabeth's reign, her advisor William Cecil is involved in a conspiracy that featured Jesuit and Irish enemies. James I's reign of course saw the Jesuits involvement in the Gunpowder Plot. In these historical examples, Catholic forces associated with deceptive speech, the Jesuits, are also associated with challenging the authority of the monarchy and rebellion

Past Scholarship

While historical scholarship has covered England's rebellions and the political machinations of the Tudor and Stuart periods, and literary scholarship has analyzed revisions of the devil during this time, scholarship has neglected the political English

devil's connection to political rebellion. Scholarship has focused on comparing religious versus secular devil portrayals, the influence of religious beliefs on secular drama, or the association of witches with the devil. According to scholars, the Tudor and Stuart periods witness the emergence of a "Protestant Devil" figure—an entity that was largely understood as "an interior presence encouraging falsehood and sin" (Oldridge 12). This belief, which has gone largely unchallenged, is supported by three key scholars and texts, and their analysis has not truly been questioned or expanded. Nathan Johnstone's 2006 *The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England* states that Protestantism saw a marked change in how the devil was viewed, changing his status from an external threat to an internal one, focused mainly on temptation. His study contends that this temptation dominates all demonic portrayals after the Reformation while also stating that his study "does not seek to argue that there was a single demonism in Early modern England" (26). Johnstone does argue against an elite versus popular understanding but he says that "the study of the Devil in Early modern English culture begins with the Reformation" (27). Darren Oldridge's 2010 revision of *The Devil in Tudor and Stuart England,* argues that the devil in Tudor England was both distinct and modern (11), that there was "no stable iconography of the Devil" in the medieval period and that there was "no single understanding of the Devil" during this time (13). This reading is contradicted by a *longue duree* analysis of the devil. There is a stable iconography and presentation throughout the medieval and early modern period, and while it flexes and adapts to incorporate new ideas and concepts, it is still recognizable throughout, and his acts of rebellion are key to this presentation. Henry Ansgar Kelly's 1970 *Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeare's Histories* analyzes the political work and bias in these

plays, and while he does not focus on how these political figures are constructed as demonic, he does mention all the devil references in the history plays.

This scholarship fails to notice or glosses over the innately political nature of devil figures. John D. Cox's scholarship, specifically his 2000 work, *The Devil and the Sacred in English Drama 1350-1642* focuses on devils in drama and draws lines between the sacred and the secular arguing that the dramatic devil is not connected to the devil presented in theology (18). This erases the political and adversarial nature of the devil which is seen in the Bible and onstage throughout the medieval and early modern periods. He states that "Protestant playwrights repeatedly identified the devil with the ritual and beliefs of traditional religion" (85) yet ignores aspects of the devil he finds inconvenient. Cox argues that the secular devil seen on stage is the religious one, ignoring folklore and popular beliefs, as well as the slippage between religion and common belief. Cox's insistence on only reading devils as secular or religious and his narrow focus on drama leaves no space for accommodating or explaining the place that popular or specifically political representations had and does not address how these figures cross from one genre to another. In fact, the political nature of the devil and his relationship to popular beliefs and genres is a consistent feature of the figure which Cox's argument ignores. He tends to acknowledge the traditional portrayal of the devil, then dismiss its importance (129). Only focusing on a single genre and only reading devils in a binary does not consider the rich history and context of the devil throughout English history and literature.

The weaknesses of these approaches in these texts are that they are too narrow, only analyzing the figure within a specific period or genre. As such, they come to

incorrect and incomplete conclusions that are easily countered when one expands the time period and genre. They do not consider the evolution of the figure, the consistency of the figure across time periods and genres, or how these devil figures act as the vehicles for the concerns, desires, anxieties, and fears of the common people. John D. Cox and Darren Oldridge argue that the devil disappears from the early modern stage because of the English Reformation and the English internalizing him and the threat he represents but this is not true as many early modern plays feature devils. The devil portrayals in these plays conform to the common understanding and therefore provide a baseline to compare plays that feature political devils against. *The Honourable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* has a devil and Mephistopheles in *Doctor Faustus* (1588) is a devil.[86] Lower level devils, familiars, and minions also appear in *The Devil is an Ass* (1616), *The Witch of Edmonton* (1621/1658), *The Virgin Martyr* (1622), *The Late Lancashire Witches* (1634), *Life of Merlin* (1641), *The Goblins* (1643), and *The Birth of Merlin* (1662). Cox and Oldbridge are correct that the devils who appear in these works are not the visually different devils of medieval drama and literature but have morphed into human figures or devils who often masquerade as humans.[87] Mephistopheles appears in human form to Faustus, as does Harpax from *The Virgin Martyr* and Peg's lover in *The*

---

[86] For more on this, see John S. Mebane's 1989 *Renaissance Magic and the Return of the Golden Age: The Occult Tradition and Marlowe, Jonson, and Shakespeare*, and Sarah Wall-Randell's 2008 "Doctor Faustus and the Printer's Devil."

[87] For more on Cox's scholarship on devils, see his 1993 "Devils and Power in Marlowe and Shakespeare," and 2000 *The Devil and the Sacred in English Drama 1350-1642*. Darren Oldridge's 2010 *The Devil in Tudor and Stuart England* is also a key text that has shaped many scholars' views on the devil during this period.

Late Lancashire Witches.[88] However, this may be as much due to changes in theatrical forms and presentations as it is to changes in religious doctrine. Despite appearing in human form, shapeshifting, as well as the roles of seducer, tempter, and deceiver, continues to mark these characters as devils. Shakespeare's devils are mainly men and women who are described in terms usually applied to the historical presentations of the devil—a monster and adversary, a visually different altern, associated with darkness and magic yet appearing human, the devil has been subsumed into human characters. In the early modern period, the devil could be anyone. Yet scholarship has not addressed demonic figures in Shakespeare's plays that complicate the common understanding of the English devil, his inherently political function, and his connection to rebellion.

Rebellion is Diabolic

Given that *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth* are the only Shakespeare plays that construct rebellion as diabolic it is important to understand both how and why they do. In each play language and speech are the how, the vehicle for constructing the diabolic.[89] Yet in this framework it is necessary to consider the historical context of when the plays are written and when they are set. Both plays make significant changes to the historical record of both Owain Glyndŵr (or Owain Glyn Dŵr, [c. 1359 – c. 1415]) and Mac Bethad mac Findláich (1005-1057), the historical King of Scots/Alba who was the inspiration for

---

[88] Tom, the dog, in *The Witch of Edmonton*, is an exception to this. While he is the symbol of Elizabeth's deal with the devil for her magical powers, Tom himself functions more as a familiar.

[89] Stephen Greenblatt explores the importance of linguistics and language and its connection to rarly modern colonies in his 1990 *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture*.

Macbeth. The Welsh consider Glyndŵr is a national hero, on par with King Arthur,[90] who is often described as having Welsh roots. Glyndŵr fights to honor the nationalism of Wales, protect his people from oppressors, and is a role model of good leadership. Mac Bethad mac Findláich did kill Duncan to become king, but in battle, not by stabbing him in his sleep. Mac Bethad mac Findláich ruled for seventeen years, by most accounts an effective king and leader who promoted Christianity.[91] He had a legitimate claim to the throne; he was not a usurper or a rebel. In fact, Mac Bethad mac Findláich's eventual defeat and death came at the hands of Máel Coluim, a result of Coluim's support of an English invasion of Scotland. Mac Bethad mac Findláich was an honorable, competent leader who represented the best interests of his country and was defeated by the English. Since Shakespeare's plays significantly revise the histories of both Owain Glyndŵr and Mac Bethad mac Findláich to reorient both towards the motif of rebellion, the question arises as to what the rhetorical or narrative purpose of this revision might be. Neither Glyndŵr nor mac Findláich betrayed their lords; in fact, both were acting in the best interest of their people. I argue that a key part of the revision is the introduction of a

[90] English appropriation of Welsh nationalistic legends as we saw in Chapter One is another type of paradox. England claims the heroic figure of Arthur and discards his problematic Welsh nature. There was also a revival in interest of Arthurian legends during James I's reign. For more on this see Paul Whitfield White's 2014 "The Admiral's Men, Shakespeare, and the Lost Arthurian Plays of Elizabethan England," Elisabeth Michelsson's 1999 *Appropriating King Arthur: The Arthurian Legend in English Drama and Entertainments,* Christopher Dean's 1987 *Arthur of England: English Attitudes to King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance,* and William Lewis Jones's 1914 *King Arthur in History and Legend.*

[91] "The historical content of Shakespeare's play is drawn from Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland,* which in turn borrows from Boece's 1527 *Scotorum Historiae*, which flattered the antecedents of Boece's patron, King James V of Scotland" ("New World Encyclopedia"). For more on this, see Alison Taufer's 1999 *Holinshed's Chronicles* and Joseph Henry Satin's 1966 *Shakespeare and His Sources*.

divinely inspired monarchy into both narratives. By refocusing these narratives around rebellion against the monarchy, Shakespeare turns them into tales about the consequences of treason, and the undeniable and unshakeable authority of the English monarchy.

In *I Henry IV,* Hotspur is the main devil, the English political devil, but he is surrounded by other devilish figures who are more in line with the common understanding of the devil. Worcester and the other earls can be read as a devilish collective, like we saw in Chapter Two, whose voices when joined together, present dangerous statements. Just as Satan's speech in Chapter Four leads to rebellion, so too does the speech of these nobles and Hotspur result in direct actions of rebellion. They create rebellion amongst the nobles, and challenge the proper authority of the king. While Worcester and the other nobles' deaths are not what restores order, they are punished for their sins. While Macbeth is revealed as the betrayer, who rebels against his rightful king for his own aims, he too is surrounded by devil signifiers. The witches do not lead anyone astray, and do not rebel, yet their speech provides Macbeth with the reasoning, and for him, the justification, to act as he's always wanted. It's also impossible to ignore the historical association of witches with devil figures. The Porter claims to be guarding the gate of hell, which makes him a devilish signifier, and certainly all the men who further Macbeth's coup, from the murderers, to the unnamed soldiers who do not question or challenge him, are also constructed as devilish signifiers. As we've seen in other chapters, there is a continuity in what constructs the demonic; poor, misguided leadership, speech that incites actions against the proper authority, a collective that challenges this authority, and a variety of devilish figures.

In both plays language constructs the demonic though their speech. In *1 Henry IV* Hotspur's speech convinces the other nobles to rebel, convinced of the righteousness of the cause. Macbeth uses speech to justify his actions to himself and then later to get others to do his evil work. Both are revealed to be motivated by personal ambition. The combination of deceptive speech, rebellion, and personal ambition are all traits attributed to the devil. In *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth,* Hotspur and Macbeth are labelled as diabolic because they are rebels and traitors who betray their kings and the monarchy, committing treason. Hotspur says he is motivated by a sense of personal wrong and a belief that the king is a poor leader and therefore must be replaced; however, he is revealed to be motivated by ambition just like Macbeth. Both justify their betrayal, Hotspur believes that the King has betrayed his nobles and Macbeth feels his ambition justifies his actions. Hotspur's rebellion in martial and political, with the goal to replace King Henry. Macbeth's rebellion, while bloody, is subtler, more underhanded. He murders his enemies to remove them, or gets others to murder to further his agenda. His insurrection occurs with almost no notice until the battle in the final act. Yet with both, the rebellions against the natural order of God and the divinely sanctioned authority of the monarchy, must be destroyed and order restored.

How Language and Speech Construct the Demonic

In *Imagined Communities,* Benedict Anderson argues that language plays an important role in defining and shaping national identity. The wide use of the vernacular in print helped to present a united image of England.[92] Conversely then, the use of

---

[92] For more on this see Duncan Hardy's 2013 "The Hundred Years War and the 'Creation' of the Written English Vernacular: A Reassessment," Francesco Crocco's

subaltern, marginalized languages were constructed as part of the ethnic difference of the Welsh, Scots, and Irish and therefore a threat to the nation of England.[93] These concerns over language as a mark of threat or a signifier that one is no longer English has historical roots. The Old English, [94] the original Norman invaders from England were seen as going native and abandoning their English identity when they adopted Irish culture and language thus becoming "Irished," and no longer English. In fact, Sir John Davies argued that one of the signs someone had been tainted by Irish influences was that they "'grew to be ashamed of their very English names . . . and took Irish surnames and nicknames,' becoming 'mere Irish in their language, names, apparel'" (qtd. in Neill 9). If the Old English, the original, foundational English, could be turned against their home culture and language any Englishman was susceptible to this wildness, this barbarity, this diabolical nature. Language and names in this case are not just markers of difference but a choice in national identity and self-identification.

Other than through choice of language—such as Welsh, Scotch, Irish—the demonic is also constructed through language as in speech, as we saw in Chapter Two. The speeches of the demonic parliament are not marked as different, but are constructed as demonic because they are a democratic collective that challenges the natural, God-

---

2014 *Literature and the Growth of British Nationalism: The Influence of Romantic Poetry and Bardic Criticism,* and Andrew Hadfield's 1994 *Literature, Politics and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance.*

[93] In both plays, rebellion and the rebels are shown in conflict with the monarchy as represented by King Henry and Duncan. These rebellions also play out on a national scale. It is important to note though there is slippage here, the nation and the king/monarchy are not interchangeable ideas.

[94] In Irish colonial studies, Old and New English does not refer to the language Old English rather it refers to the initial wave of English lords who settled in Ireland, the Old English, and more recent Englishmen who relocated, the New English.

given, authority in the form of Christ as monarchy. In both *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth* this understanding of language as innately political speech, meant to persuade, convince, deceive, and challenge the monarchy is used. Hotspur creates a demonic collective of rebelling nobles though his speech. The rebellious characters are identified at the beginning of the play: the Earl of Worcester, Percy, Early of Northumberland, Henry Percy (Hotspur), Kate, Lady Percy, Lord Edmund Mortimer, Lady Mortimer, Owen Glendower, Earl of Douglas, Sir Richard Vernon, Scrope, Archbishop of York and Sir Michael are all listed as rebels against King Henry. Macbeth is not initially named as rebellious and treasonous and does not form so clear a collective, other than Lady Macbeth and the murderers. Many of the people who further Macbeth's cause are unaware of his intent or the consequences of his actions.

Glendower is the clearest example of a devilish figure who conforms to the common understanding of what a devil is supposed to be. He is Welsh, so he is visually, ethnically, different. His native speech, which is not translated for the characters or audience, is demonic because it is Welsh. He begins the rebellion that enables the nobles like Worcester to use persuasive speech to entice other nobles to rebel, and allows Hotspur to challenge the king's rightful authority. Glendower may not be the focus, but he enables the actions of the English political devil figure of Hotspur who is the focus of the play. Glendower's Welshness, specifically his use of the Welsh language, which is not translated for the characters or the audience, is initially presented at first as a mark of demonic and ethnic difference. Glendower is further constructed as demonic by linking him to the devil and envy (1.3.114-115) and treason (2.4.21) by others. Westmoreland

says Glendower is "irregular and wild" (1.1.40).[95] In this instance, "irregular" means not in conformity with rule or principle, contrary to rule, and disorderly in action or conduct (*OED*). Even before he agrees to take part in the rebellion he is described as countering the natural order. In this way, Glendower functions as a bogeyman, a function common to the devil, before he ever appears onstage. Glendower is unnatural from the beginning because he is Welsh and demonic.[96] When Glendower and Hotspur finally meet with the other nobles to plan the logistics of the rebellion, Glendower constructs himself as demonic by describing his birth as hellish, with "fiery shapes" appearing as soon as he is born (3.1.13). This language that evokes hell imagery mirrors presentations of monstrous births in other literature and pamphlets. From the beginning of the play Glendower is defined by others as a wild, barbaric Welshman, with his physical nature making his diabolical actions inevitable. His willing participation in the rebellion from 3.1 on confirms his demonic nature. Glendower and his initial rebellion is the demonic foundation for the actions of the nobles as demonic collective and Hotspur as devilish leader.

---

[95] For scholarship on Glendower, see Morgan Moore's 2015 *How Wales Was Made so Happy: Exploring Nation and Nonsense in Shakespeare's Treatment of the Welsh,* Herbert Fackler's 1970 "Shakespeare's 'Irregular and Wild' Glendower: The Dramatic Use of Source Materials," and R. Davies's 2000 "Shakespeare's Glendower and Owain Glyn Dwr." For scholarship on Macbeth, see Arthur Kinney's 2001 *Lies Like Truth: Shakespeare, Macbeth, and the Cultural Moment,* Garry Wills's 1995 *Witches and Jesuits: Shakespeare's Macbeth,* Leon H. Craig's 2001 *Of Philosophers and Kings: Political Philosophy in Shakespeare's Macbeth and King Lear,* John Julius Norwich's 2001 *Shakespeare's Kings: The Great Plays and the History of England in the Middle Ages, 1337-1485,* and Paul Alexander Joseph Beehler's 2000 *Reforming Religious Representatives: Shakespeare's Disruptive Historical Acts.*

[96] Espinosa's reading also emphasized the "barbaric nature of the Welsh" and the "beastly" nature (76).

The main devil in *1 Henry IV* is not Glendower but Hotspur. He is the internal threat to England and the authority of the king. Likewise, while the witches and the Porter show demonic markers, Macbeth is the true devil of the play who betrays the authority of his lord (thane) and poses a threat to the natural authority of Duncan and the Scottish nation. Hotspur and Macbeth are constructed as the devils of the play because they betray their lords, oppose the natural order and authority of the monarchy, and convince others to rebel. Yet both men are first defined, like Lucifer before the fall, as the best and brightest their nations have to offer. Hotspur, like Macbeth, does not start off as a devil. He is "the gallant Hotspur" (1.1.52) who serves the king's interests in defeating the Scots at the battle of Holmedon (1402 historically). Hotspur's actions are so great that the king is envious of Lord Northumberland who has "so blest a son" (1.1.79). King Henry has Hal, a wastrel who spends his time with lowlifes like Falstaff[97] who rob and carouse rather than serve his nation. While Prince Hal is off carousing with Falstaff, Hotspur is defending the nation's interests against threats. Even after Hotspur has fomented rebellion and betrayed the king he is still described as "This gallant Hotspur, this all-praised knight," (3.2.145) who has "honor" (3.2.147). Hal promises his father that he will redeem him own "degenerate" (3.2.133) nature by defeating Hotspur, that killing him will wash away his own shame (3.2.142). Even at the end of the play, Prince Hal describes Hotspur as "A very valiant rebel" (5.4.64). Both King Henry and Hal's ability

[97] Falstaff's character and actions have some overlap with devilish figures. He is an example of carnival, he challenges and mimics authority, yet in the end, his actions only reinforce the norm. While Hal is temporarily led astray by him, Hal eventually proves his worth to be king. Likewise, Falstaff's actions are small, petty, and personal, never reaching a political level. Falstaff's defeat and death are also not a requirement for the restoration of order.

to still see Hotspur as a good man, a potential resource for the nation, even after he rebels posits that redemption is always possible. It also highlights own goodness by offering forgiveness. This claim to goodness, the fact that Hotspur believes that he is doing the right thing, separates Hotspur's construction as a rebelling devil from Macbeth's. Hotspur's construction as devil is also different because while Hotspur is presented as the instigator of rebellion, he is contrasted against Worcester as a political operator and traitor, and the assumed devil of the play, Glendower.

Hotspur's paradoxical role as "A valiant rebel" in part justifies his rebellion. He is a noble soldier who always has the best interests of England at heart. Hotspur tells the other lords that their actions are justified because Henry is an "unthankful king" (1.3.139) who does not return the loyalty of his subjects, as seen in King Henry's treatment of Mortimer. Hotspur's speech exposes Henry as a bad king, an unlawful one, and therefore one the rebelling lords do not owe their loyalty to. This in turn defines their rebellion as righteous. Notice that what makes Hotspur dangerous and demonic is his speech. Hotspur describes King Henry as a "detested blot" (1.3.166). He argues that King Richard named Mortimer as his heir (1.3.158-160), says the lords have been "fooled" (1.3.182) and shamed by this king. He goes on to say the only way they:

> may redeem
>
> Your banished honors and restore yourselves
>
> Into the good thoughts of the world again,
>
> Revenge the jeering and disdained contempt
>
> Of this proud king, who studies day and night

> To answer all the debt he owes to you
>
> Even with the bloody payment of your deaths. (1.3.184-190)

Worcester and Northumberland advise him to temper his speech and actions, to slow down, but they still go along even though they disagree with his methods. Hotspur argues “We’ll be revenged on him” (1.3.302) and while Worcester tells him to wait, he still moves forward with the plan for rebellion, saying that he’ll set up a meeting with Glendower, Mortimer, Douglas, and Hotspur, a meeting that comes to fruition in 3.1. Later in Act 4 Hotspur adds to his list of grievances against the king. He says that the king deceived them, took their “gifts,” their support, their “oaths,” (4.3.77) and then did not return their loyalty. The king refused to “reform” (4.3.84) to the detriment of “the commonwealth” (4.3.86). He ignored the “abuses” (4.3.87) of the people, and those who spoke against it. His greatest sin was deposing the rightful king (4.397), disgracing others (4.31.4). Hotspur’s argument is that King Henry betrayed his noble, his people, and his nation, and because of that is not the true king. Because he has “Broke oath on oath, committed wrong on wrong,” (4.3.108) their rebellion is not only justified but righteous, and necessary, an argument we will see again in Chapter Four and *Paradise Lost.* If a monarch proves himself false, it is the right and responsibility of the people to act against him. Again, the importance of speech, words, and oaths is emphasized. This seen too in Macbeth named as tyrant fifteen times, more often than in any other Shakespeare play” (Shapiro, *Year of Lear* 214). How leaders are named, identified, and described signals how they are treated and reacted to.

Hotspur justifies his own treason and rebellion by invalidating King Henry’s rule. This allows him to rationalize his shifting allegiance easily, his loyalty to what he sees as

a greater purpose, England. Hotspur sees his rebellion as the only way to serve the greater good. When King Henry describes Mortimer as “foolish” and states that he “hath willfully betrayed / The lives of those that he did lead to fight” (1.3.83-4) and says he will not ransom Mortimer, Hotspur sees this personal betrayal as evidence that King Henry is unfit to rule. When Hotspur refers to “Revolted Mortimer!” (1.3.95), Hotspur is “revolted” at the King’s treatment of Mortimer, and cites Mortimer’s treatment as the inciting incident for their rebellion. He then goes on to list Mortimer’s accomplishments, how “valiantly” (1.3.99) he fought, how “noble” (1.3.113) he is. Because Hotspur will not let Mortimer “be slandered with revolt” (1.3.115), he must rebel against the king. These same traits are also used to describe Hotspur. Unlike Macbeth who only acts out of self-interest, Hotspur believes he is serving larger interests. Yet both are constructed as diabolic because the rebel, and their intent and motives are irrelevant because the fact that they chose to act against the monarchy constructs them as demonic, which becomes the only defining characteristic. Hotspur’s descriptions of King Henry demonstrate all the ways that the king, and therefore his authority, is not legitimate.

While Hotspur justifies his rebellion by stating that King Henry has broken his oath, King Henry echoes this language at the end of the play, creating a narrative frame around speech, oaths, trust, obedience, and the divine right to rule. We will see this technique again in Chapter Four with *Paradise Lost.* The king tells Worcester and Vernon that “You have deceived our trust” (5.1.12). King Henry asks them to account for their actions and how their actions risked the nation, “And made us doff our easy robes of peace / To crush our old limbs in ungentle steel. / This is not well, my lord; this is not well. / What say you to it?” (5.1.13-16). In this way, King Henry shows he is a good king,

as Weiler defines it, because he wants to ensure peace and defend the realm (Weiler 7). While Hotspur acts impulsively, King Henry is tempered, patient, further displaying traits of good leadership. Worcester tries to defend himself by saying that it was King Henry's favoritism, his betrayal of his oaths, that created the rebellion. Worcester presents their grievances in an attempt to place blame for the rebellion on King Henry:

> Forgot your oath to us at Doncaster;
>
> And being fed by us, you used us so
>
> As that ungentle gull, the cuckoo's bird,
>
> Useth the sparrow—did oppress our nest,
>
> Grew by our feeding to so great a bulk
>
> That even our love durst not come near your sight
>
> For fear of swallowing; but with nimble wing
>
> We were enforced for safety sake to fly
>
> Out of your sight and raise this present head,
>
> Whereby we stand opposèd by such means
>
> As you yourself have forged against yourself
>
> By unkind usage, dangerous countenance,
>
> And violation of all faith and troth
>
> Sworn to us in your younger enterprise. (5.1.59-72)

But King Henry responds by accusing him of making excuses, explaining that there is never a good reason for "rebellion" (5.1.75) and "insurrection" (5.1.80), for opposing the natural and divinely supported order of the monarchy. Yet both King Henry and Hal continue to praise Hotspur, as "gentleman" (90), "active valiant" (91), "daring" and

"bold" (92). Hal admits that Hotspur puts him to shame, and both the king and Hal offer leniency to Worcester, and offer to show it to Hotspur, placing the nation, the good of the people, above their own interests. I argue that by doing so they do what the rebels cannot, act in the best interests of England. Yet Worcester and Vernon decide the king could never truly forgive them, arguing he would remember their "treason" (5.2.11), and would punish them for it (5.28). Ironically, they think Hotspur, the true instigator of the rebellion, would ultimately be forgiven,

> My nephew's trespass may be well forgot;
> It hath the excuse of youth and heat of blood,
> And an adopted name of privilege—
> A harebrained Hotspur governed by a spleen.
> All his offenses live upon my head
> And on his father's. We did train him on,
> And his corruption being ta'en from us,
> We as the spring of all shall pay for all. (5.2.18-25)

Hotspur's youth, his out-of-balance humors,[98] excuse his rebellion, while the older soldiers and nobles, who should have known better, will be punished for their deeds. Even though Hotspur's speech is what begins and continues the rebellion, he is absolved at the end. While Worcester may regret that, there is no way. When he reports on his

---

[98] Jonathan Seitz's 2011 *Witchcraft and Inquisition in Early Modern Venice* argues that melancholy and other humors actually made someone more susceptible to demonic possession, as it made "a body more hospitable place for demons" (145). While Hotspur's characterization is more in line with the English political devils we've seen, the idea that he could be possessed would make him more like the weak, bedeviled men of *Gesta* than the devilish leaders.

encounter to Hotspur continues to describe the king as "oath-breaking" (5.2.40) and "forsworn" (5.2.41). The rebels cannot move past their initial reasons for rebellion, they cannot reconcile themselves to the obedience needed to undo the effects of their treason and rebellion. Once the demonic collective has formed, even though it may fracture and weaken, it is not dissolved. Even though Worcester and Vernon regret their actions, they are powerless, in light of the true devil, Hotspur, to act against him.

Hotspur contaminates the other nobles with his demonic speech which leads them to diabolical rebellion. The opening of Act 3 is action based, putting the rebellion in motion with the men dividing the areas on the map and planning the logistics of their rebellion yet words and speech initiate these actions. Hotspur continues to frame the rebellion as righteous, even though they are aligning with England's enemy, Glendower. Hotspur acknowledges that this is problematic when he questions how Glendower "angers me" (3.1.152), comparing his ambiguous, nonsense, Welsh words with Merlin's vague prophecies (3.1.154). Yet, just as Merlin whose demonic parentage ultimately served the greater purpose of England, so too will Glendower. Again, the nobles seek to mediate Hotspur's temper with Mortimer arguing that Glendower is a gentleman and Worcester advising Hotspur to mend his "fault" (3.1.185) in testing Glendower's patience. But again, while they appear to disagree with Hotspur, his speech is so persuasive they still follow him, and his rebellion. Immediately following this, King Henry acknowledges that Hotspur's rebellion is a threat, to "shake the peace and safety of our throne" (3.2.121) because he has been able to join together "Percy, Northumberland, / The Archibishop's Grace of York, Douglas, / Mortimer" (3.2.122-124). As soon as they are named as rebels, the coalition begins to break down due to illness, characters not

showing up, Glendower disappearance, from both the rebellion and the stage, and the nobles voice their regret over following Hotspur's ill-humored leadership.

Just as demonic speech creates rebellion, divine speech, and the naming of evil restores order. When King Henry and Hal discuss the rebellion, and their response to it in 3.2, both emphasize the fact that their monarchy, their rule, is favored by God, and that they act "in the name of God" (3.2.158). If rebellion is by definition diabolical, then the monarchy is by definition divine. Their rule is righteous and divinely appointed, so the rebellion must fail. Hotspur, Glendower, and the nobles plan the rebellion in 3.1 and then King Henry names them as rebels in 3.2, "A hundred thousand rebels die in this" (3.2.165), which is reaffirmed by Blunt just a few lines later when he specifically names Mortimer, Douglas, and "the English rebels" (3.2.170). Here the naming resets order and reality. Emphasizing the destructive nature of rebellion, its unmaking nature. It is also telling that just after being recognized as a rebellious collective, the collective begins to fracture, fighting amongst themselves.

As a reflection of a changed historical moment, Macbeth's language and resulting rebellion is subtler, occurs on a faster timeline, and is complete. Macbeth does not get nobles to rebel, rather he is the rebellion. He rebels against Duncan, and commits treason when he kills him, to serve his own ambition. He does not challenge the power of the monarchy, he takes it by force. Hotspur's diabolic rebellion is more clear-cut, upfront, from the beginning of the play, a reflection of the numerous but unsuccessful rebellions that were present during the last decade of Elizabeth's reign. Rather than experiencing numerous internal and external rebellions, the first three years of James' reign was defined by one specific rebellion, The Gunpowder Plot (1605), also called the

Gunpowder Treason Plot, or the Jesuit Treason, an attempted assassination of James I. The rebellion was defined by Jesuits, the attempted destruction of the House of Lords, and internal betrayal. This rebellion is internal, unexpected, and fractured the country. The conspirators were tried in early 1606, the year *Macbeth* is first performed so it is no surprise that the play highlights the immorality of assassination and equivocation, a form of speech understood as "a tool of Satanic temptation in the 17th century" (Agari 549). Just as we saw in Chapter Two, this revisits the idea that unfettered or uncensored speech can be dangerous and demonic.

Just as Glendower is a distraction from the true threats, the true devil of the play, so too are the witches in *Macbeth* a similar distraction. I argue that these red herrings serve to counter audience expectations of the demonic while also emphasizing the unseen danger of internal rebellions to the stability of the monarchy. They also draw distinctions between the different ways language constructs the demonic. The three witches do speak spells, equivocate, and inspire Macbeth. Yet while they do equivocate by not providing Macbeth with all the information, Macbeth alone is responsible for his actions. The witches use ambiguous language to obscure the truth but they do not act in a diabolical manner. They deceive, but with no clear aim through most of the play (until scolded by Hecate), and they are not tied to rebellion. In 1.1, when the three witches first appear, they prophesize their meeting with Macbeth and while not named as conjuring their rhyming dialogue certainly reads like other conjuring scenes from the early modern period. Their language is also prevarication, seen in 1.3 when they prophesize Macbeth becoming thane, then king. While the witches do not reveal the whole truth here, what they state is fairly straight forward. This is not true of the final prophecy. In 4.1, when

Macbeth goes to the witches to learn his fate, they prophesize and conjure, further blurring the line between the two as well as the line between truth and lies. Nothing in this prophecy is what it seems. First, the witches do not speak this prophecy, it comes in the form of three apparitions. The first tells Macbeth to "Beware Macduff" (4.1.81). The second tells him "for none of woman born / Shall harm Macbeth" (4.1.91-2). The third tells Macbeth that he "shall never be vanquished be until / Great Birnam Wood to high Dunsinane Hill / Shall come against him" (4.1.105-107). The witches conjure these apparitions, an act of deception, and the apparitions equivocate, another act of deception. This prophesy predicts that no man born of woman can defeat Macbeth Macduff's birth through Caesarian section provides the loophole to this statement. Despite qualities and actions that historically were portrayed as demonic, the witches are not constructed as demonic as the play includes no descriptions of the commonly understood ethnic or visual difference. The closest is when they are described as "So wither'd and so wild in their attire" (1.3.41). They are also not presented as adversaries, or devilish, and they do not rebel. Likewise, while the play names Scotland as the setting, the play lacks any descriptions of characters as ethnically different, demonic alterns. There is also no use of the Scottish language as a mark of difference as seen with Welsh in *1 Henry IV*. The Scots are also not constructed as demonic, unsurprising with James on the throne.

While the witches are not the devilish threats of the play, they do reveal Macbeth as the true devil of the play through his reactions to their language, how he uses the information they give him. His associations with them would be enough but he also then purposely invites and encourages their demonic speech. He asks them to "Speak if you can" (1.3.50), inviting their speech, their equivocation. Macbeth is looking for an excuse

to act how he already wants to. No one makes him betray and rebel. Banquo, as a counter to Macbeth emphasizes the idea of importance of truth. He asks the witches to speak "I' th' name of truth" (1.3.55) and asks why they speak to Macbeth but "To me you speak not" (1.3.60), and asks them to "Speak, then, to me, who neither beg nor fear/Your favors nor your hate" (1.3.63-4). Yet the very reason that they don't speak to Banquo is because he does not beg their favor or fear their words. He is a true and good man and therefore is not susceptible to the witches' verbal tricks. Their words cannot construct him as demonic. Banquo from the beginning questions the truth of the witches' words (1.3.92) further evidence of his goodness while Macbeth chooses to use the prophecies as an excuse to act the way he wants, to further his own ambition. Banquo's words act as a counter to the equivocation of the witches as he asks again and again for the truth. He wants clarity, not ambiguity, but Macbeth only hears what he wants because it is an excuse to act on his ambition. He ignores Banquo's attempts to correct his misunderstandings. Right before Macbeth convinces himself to kill Duncan, Banquo again speaks to him about "the three Weird Sisters / To you they have showed some truth" (2.1.25-6). Banquo does not doubt the accuracy of the prophecy but senses that they have not been completely honest and seeks to interrogate this ambiguity but Macbeth's reply is "I think not of them" (2.1.27). He only promises to debate the issue with Banquo later, an action Macbeth has no desire to follow through on as the truth does not serve Macbeth's interests.

In 1.7 Macbeth uses his own words, his own speech, to convince himself that he is justified in acting against his king because the witches have prophesized it:

If it were done when ’tis done, then ’twere well

It were done quickly. If th’ assassination

Could trammel up the consequence and catch

With his surcease success, that but this blow

Might be the be-all and the end-all here,

But here, upon this bank and shoal of time,

We’d jump the life to come. But in these cases

We still have judgment here, that we but teach

Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return

To plague th’ inventor. This even-handed justice

Commends th’ ingredience of our poisoned chalice

To our own lips. He’s here in double trust:

First, as I am his kinsman and his subject,

Strong both against the deed; then, as his host,

Who should against his murderer shut the door,

Not bear the knife myself. Besides, this Duncan

Hath borne his faculties so meek, hath been

So clear in his great office, that his virtues

Will plead like angels, trumpet-tongued, against

The deep damnation of his taking-off;

And pity, like a naked newborn babe

Striding the blast, or heaven’s cherubim horsed

Upon the sightless couriers of the air,

Shall blow the horrid deed in every eye,

That tears shall drown the wind. I have no spur

To prick the sides of my intent, but only

Vaulting ambition, which o'erleaps itself

And falls on th' other— (1.7.1-28)

Macbeth's ambiguity at the beginning, his inner conflict, is revealed through the use of "if" in the first several lines- "If it were done when 'tis done" and "If th' assassination." It continues with the use of "might" and "but." Yet this display of inner turmoil seems inauthentic. We know from his interaction with Banquo that Macbeth is not interested in the truth. Macbeth acknowledges that he owes Duncan his loyalty because he is Duncan's "kinsman" and "his subject" and owes him further obedience and loyalty under the rules of hospitality, acting "as his host" who is supposed to protect him, not murder him. Yet Macbeth acknowledges by the end of his speech that he has no reason to betray Duncan except his "vaulting ambition" but he does not care. Macbeth's final, cutoff thoughts reveal that the entire speech was just Macbeth presenting the counterargument for why he should not murder Duncan when all along he knows he always intended to fulfill the prophecy. Even Macbeth's words to himself are a deception.

Even though the witches and the Porter are described with demonic traits, within the play they are not demonic, because they do not rebel. Rather their purpose in the play is to reveal Macbeth as the true devil of the play. The witches' equivocation provides Macbeth a choice, and when he chooses to serve his own interest, he proves he is a devil. The Porter then confirms that Macbeth is the devil:

> Here's a knocking indeed! If a man were porter of hell gate, he should have old turning the key. *(Knock.)* Knock, knock, knock! Who's there, i' th' name of Beelzebub? Here's a farmer that hanged himself on th' expectation of plenty. Come in time! Have napkins enough about you; here you'll sweat for't. *(Knock.)* Knock, knock! Who's there, in th' other devil's name? Faith, here's an equivocator that could swear in both the scales against either scale, who committed treason enough for God's sake yet could not equivocate to heaven. O, come in, equivocator. *(Knock.)* Knock, knock, knock! Who's there? Faith, here's an English tailor come hither for stealing out of a French hose. Come in, tailor. Here you may roast your goose. *(Knock.)* Knock, knock! Never at quiet.—What are you?—But this place is too cold for hell. I'll devil-porter it no further. I had thought to have let in some of all professions that go the primrose way to th' everlasting bonfire. *(Knock.)*
>
> Anon, anon! (2.3.1-20)

The Porter names himself as the "porter of hell gate" therefore naming Cawdor as either hell, or an entrance to hell, a hellmouth.[99] Cawdor is an "everlasting bonfire" and Macbeth specifically named as its "Beelzebub" and "other devil." Even though the Porter admits Macduff and Lennox, they are initially demonized by their associations with Macbeth as the Porter greets them by saying "O, come in, equivocator." Macbeth's

---

[99] For more on reading this scene as a Harrowing of Hell episode, see K. Schreyer's 2010 "'Here's a Knocking Indeed!' Macbeth and the Harrowing of Hell," Colin Wilcockson's 2003 "The Harrowing of Hell Motif in Shakespeare's Macbeth," Christopher Baker's 2011 "Saint Peter and Macbeth's Porter," Frederic B. Tromly's 1975 "Macbeth and His Porter," and Glynne Wickham's 1966 "Hell-Castle and Its Door-Keeper."

demonic nature is so strong it could even contaminate good men. Shakespeare allows the reader "to reflect on the living hell that the Macbeths will henceforth experience—and impose on Scotland" (Shapiro, *The Year of Lear* 183). The Porter is the inverse of St. Peter. Both are gatekeepers, with St. Peter allowing entry into heaven for the worthy and the Porter allowing entry into hell on earth. The Porter inquires if "Beelzebub" (2.3.3)[100] is knocking for entrance or a devil by another name (2.3.7), assuming only devils, be they actual devils or human ones, would willingly seek entrance into hell. He ends by stating that "this place is too cold for hell. I'll devil-porter it no further" (2.3.15-16).[101] The Porter calls to mind previous portrayals of comic devils and fools who appear to be the only ones capable of recognizing and then speaking the truth. While the witches lay the groundwork for Macbeth to reveal himself as the devil of the play it is the Porter who confirms Macbeth's demonic nature.

At first glance, Lady Macbeth would seem to embody many of the elements that construct the English political devil. She takes part in her husband's rebellion. She uses speech to persuade, and needle, her husband, into his actions. She certainly challenges perceptions of patriarchal authority, which in other early modern plays constructs women as witches, and threats to larger power structures. Yet, just as we saw with Worcester and Vernon, while she pays the price for her involvement, her death is not required for the restoration of order. While she may push Macbeth to follow his ambition, he quickly leaves her advice and counsel behind, distancing himself as he gains more power. The

---

[100] As we saw in Chapter Two, Beelzebub is often the title, "Prince of Hell" given to Satan.

[101] This reference both draws the line between metaphor and reality and evokes folklore that places hell in the north like Scotland, and describes it as a place of ice.

slippage between the demonic qualities she embodies, versus the fact that there are no female devils constructed as political devils, may be an indication of the later composition of *Macbeth.*

Just as Macbeth uses his own words to convince himself to act, he also uses his speech to convince others to commit evil on his behalf. When he decides in Act 3 that Banquo must be removed because he stands between Macbeth and the throne he calls in two murderers and asks them "Have you considered of my speeches?" (3.1.84). By naming Banquo as "enemy" (3.1.130) he constructs him as one. Macbeth's words convince the murderers to act when he cannot, "We shall, my lord, / Perform what you command us" (3.1.143-4). Macbeth's words, his speech, is dangerous because it creates actions in others and because these words that lead to actions disrupt the natural order, upset the idea of Banquo as the vehicle for monarchial authority. The three witches state that Banquo will be "Lesser than Macbeth, and greater / Not so happy, yet much happier. / Thou shalt get kings, though thou be none" (1.364-69). Even though Banquo will not be king, according to the prophecy he is the vehicle for the continuance of the monarchial authority. Whether or not Macbeth's pawns are convinced is immaterial as the end result is the same, they commit evil acts because of Macbeth's speech. Macbeth reinforces the fact that his words lead to actions when Lady Macbeth asks what is to be done about Banquo and Macbeth replies that "Thou marvel'st at my words, but hold thee still. / Things bad begun make strong themselves by ill" (3.3.61-2). Macbeth is consciously aware of what he is creating and doing with his words. In this way, he is a combination of the devilish leaders we saw in *Gesta regum Anglorum* who lead others astray and the devilish, deceptive speech in *Þe Deulis Perlament*. When Macbeth uses "speech" or

"words" they have consequences in the actions he and others take. Ironically, neither the witches nor the Porter use these phrases. When "speech" or "words" is used in association with Banquo, it always involves a revealing of truth. This is part of what marks him as a role model, a counter to Macbeth's demonic nature. A similar construction is seen with Macduff. When in 4.3, Ross comes to Macduff and says, "I have words" (224) he is revealing the awful truth that Macduff's wife, children, and servants were "Savagely slaughtered" (241). This truth then becomes the motivation for Malcolm encouraging Macduff to seek revenge and act against Macbeth. Macduff is a hero, like Banquo, a counter to Macbeth and his diabolical rebellion, who acts with truth not deception or equivocation, on his side.

Heroes as Mechanism of the Restoration of Monarchial Authority

Rebellion is diabolic and unnatural, an affront to God's order, therefore it cannot succeed. Yet it is not enough for the rebellion to be stopped. The devilish leader who began the rebellion must be defeated and replaced by a good leader, a role model, to ensure that the rebellion does not rise again and that the survival and success of the monarchy is assured. At the end of *1 Henry IV* order is restored when Hal acts in a manner befitting his station. He puts the good of the realm ahead of his personal actions, he leaves behind Falstaff and his schemes, and puts down the rebellion by killing its instigator, Hotspur. In fact, Hal must kill Hotspur to fulfill his destiny and embrace his role in the monarchy. It is only through Hotspur's death and defeat that Hal can become Prince, worthy to become king,

> I am the Prince of Wales; and think not, Percy,
>
> To share with me in glory any more.

> Two stars keep not their motion in one sphere,
>
> Nor can one England brook a double reign
>
> Of Harry Percy and the Prince of Wales. (5.4.64-68)

The fact that Hal wins is proof that God blessed him, and his future rule. In the end, Hal reveals that while Hotspur may have said that he had noble goals and inspiration for the rebellion, in the end, he was motivated by "Ill-weaved ambition" (5.4.90), the same sin as Macbeth. Order is restored because Hal takes on his ordained destiny, and King Henry defeats the English rebels. While the rebellion of Glendower haunts the end of the play, because Hal has assumed his rightful position, their win, the continued success of the monarchy and the nation is assured:

> Myself and you, son Harry, will towards Wales
>
> To fight with Glendower and the Earl of March.
>
> Rebellion in this land shall lose his sway,
>
> Meeting the check of such another day.
>
> And since this business so fair is done,
>
> Let us not leave till all our own be won. (5.5.41-46)

When England, and its monarchs are united, and internal rebellion is defeated, there is nothing that can stop the righteous authority, not even external threats such as Glendower. Historically, Glendower's rebellion was repressed by the English by 1409 when he was last defeated in battle, although he was last seen in 1412, and not reported dead until 1415.

While the action of the play presents the devil defeated, order restored, and the stability of the nation assured, the historical moment is more complicated. *2 Henry IV*

(1600/1623) reveals that things are not as tidy as the ending of *1 Henry IV* presents. Glendower's rebellion continues to haunt England, Hal tries to serve in his new, given role as heir, but is not completely successful. England's stability is threatened by the Welsh rebellion, an unproven heir, and the uncertainty presented by an ill then dying king. The play reflects the uncertainty of the historical moment, Elizabeth's unstable ending rule, with no heir, and no clear successor. England's anxieties are seen in the total tetralogies of the Henry plays. *Richard II* (1600/1623) focuses on a monstrous leader, a tyrant, who grasps for power, illegitimately. Elizabeth I did not want this play to be performed, and scholars have drawn parallels between Richard's unfitness and Elizabeth's. The performance of *Richard II* also occurred on the eve of Robert Devereux's Essex Rebellion, in 1601 which nominally sought to "save" Elizabeth from corrupt advisors, but still presented a challenge to her rule. Both Richard II and Elizabeth I had no heirs, and were characterized as not serving the best interests of the nation. The end of Elizabeth's rule was haunted by rebellion and uncertainty. There did not seem to be a clear way to restore order and ensure the stability of the nation. While *1 Henry IV* writes a history/future where England is stable and successful, the truth was not as clear cut, or optimistic, about England's continued success.

Just as it takes a good leader, a divinely anointed one, Hal, to defeat the diabolical rebel Hotspur, so too it takes a righteous soldier, a role model, Macduff, to defeat the diabolical rebel Macbeth. At the beginning of the play Macduff is described as a good, honorable, loyal soldier. He seeks nothing for himself, he only wants the rightful king restored, Scotland saved, and it is these qualities that allow him to succeed against Macbeth. He is "Worthy Macduff" (5.6.4), worthy of the honor of defending Scotland,

but also invoking the Nine Worthies, models of leadership and kingly nature. Blessed by Fortune (5.7.27) and an honorable man, he even gives Macbeth a chance to yield, as King Henry did with Worcester and the other rebels. Yet Macbeth in his arrogance and pride, his demonic sins, refuses, and is killed. When Macduff returns to Malcolm he enters with Macbeth's head and says "Hail, King! For so thou art" (5.8.65) confirming that he is a loyal subject and will not attempt to capitalize on his heroism, fomenting more rebellion. He serves the monarchy and bests interests of the nation, not himself. Macduff's acknowledgement of Malcolm ensures the monarchy will continue as it should.

In *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth* rebellion is constructed as diabolic because it counters the righteous authority of the monarchy. Language and speech that deceives, persuades, inflames, and initiates rebellious action is also constructed as demonic. If the demonic, democratic collective in Chapter Two held the threat of damage speech could do to the authority of the monarchy, *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth* are the fulfillment of these threats. Both Hotspur and Macbeth's rebellions are successful because of their speech, because they convince others to act. While these rebellions may begin on a personal level with both Hotspur and Macbeth feeling personally wronged, these personal slights become the inciting incident for rebellion so rebellion moves from the personal to the national stage. Hotspur believes King Henry betrayed his nobles, Macbeth believes he deserves more. However, because political rebellion threatens the divinely blessed power structure and authority of the rightful king it must be defeated. Good leader, loyal soldiers, role models who can counter the demonic influence like Hal and Macduff are what is needed to defeat diabolical rebellions and restore order.

The rebellions that occurred at the end of Elizabeth's reign, and the beginning of James,' the anxieties and concerns over these rebellions are reflected in both *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth.* If a valiant and noble man like Hotspur can persuade other nobles to betray their king and side with a historical enemy, if a loyal soldier such as Macbeth can murder his king and betray his nation, then anyone can. As England moves towards civil war in the middle of the 17th century, issues surrounding good leadership, Parliament, the dangers of speech, and the threat of rebellion only increase. These same issues are at the heart of the English Civil War beginning in 1642, the execution of Charles I in 1649, Cromwell and Parliament's rise to power during the Interregnum 1649-1660, and the Restoration in 1660. Milton responds to these issues, first in *In Quintum Novembris* (1626), a response to the Gunpowder Plot, then in *Paradise Lost*, in 1667 and then again in 1674. Yet if *Henry IV* and *Macbeth* highlight the consequences of rebellion, an issue revisited in Chapter Four, *Paradise Lost* also provides the answers. If good, God-fearing, loyal citizens exist, then they can stand up to demonic influences, and ultimately ensure the success and prosperity of the nation.

Chapter Four: *Paradise Lost's* Reformed Devil

In William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum (*1125), *Þe Deulis Parlement* (1430), *1 Henry IV* (1596-7/1598), and *Macbeth* (1606/1623) the political devil serves to distinguish good leaders from devilish ones, to construct Parliaments and other political structures and speech as demonic, and to characterize rebellion as diabolical. In each text, the presentation of the devil differs from the popular understanding of the devil; he is not the ethnically and visually different, animalistic devil. What he is is a leader who taints and infests his nobles and the countries. He deceives through speech, using equivocation to lead his followers to believe one thing when he intends another, but also deceiving himself through equivocation, where his narrative of the nation he imagines, and his role in it can never be achieved. He foments rebellion, and betrays both higher ideals and those close to him.

In *Gesta* the devil is not even the focus of the text; instead he is a signifier of a leader's devilishness, his inability to lead. In *Þe Deulis Parlement*, the demonic is the collective of democratic voices that mimic political structures but are incapable of true creation or power. *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth* illustrate the danger rebellion poses to the stability of the rightful English monarchy. Similarly, to *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth, Paradise Lost* uses the setting of the safer historical past to make potentially inflammatory arguments about post-Restoration England that critiques physical structures, such as cities and walls and doors and political structures like hierarchies. It also critiques the dangers of speech, monarchy, and tyranny. The setting of *Paradise Lost* is prelapsarian, so there is no nation, no political structures before the fall. Within the

interior logic of the epic, the closest the reader gets to a nation-state[102] is the mimicked physical and political structures, of Pandæmonium.[103] God and Christ stand-in for tyranny and the monarchy. This setting of time and place distance it from the current concerns at the time of the writing, an intent emphasized to the censors of the time to get the epic published.

In Chapter One we saw the effects of devilish leadership on the newly formed English nation and in Chapter Two we see the dangers Parliament represents, with its democratic and collective nature constructed as demonic. Chapter Three combines the effects of devilish leadership on the nation with the dangers of internal rebellion. In *Paradise Lost,* these three demonic hazards intersect in the figure of Satan. I argue that these three political, demonic elements are unique of the English devil and the combination of all three of these characteristics in the figure of Satan is a large part of what defines Milton's Satan as an English devil. Supporting this is the conscious nationalistic work Milton is doing in *Paradise Lost.* This type of nationalistic analysis of the devil in *Paradise Lost* has not been done. Previous scholarship on *Paradise Lost* has focused on reading God as representational of Milton's concerns over monarchy, how the text counters and conforms to epic conventions, the possible sources and analogues Milton used, the revolutionary nature of the epic, and how to read the epic in the context of Milton's other works. Satan's temptation of Eve, the characterization of Eve, the religious politics of the epic, and tracing animal and geographic tropes are also popular

[102] "Nation-state" is Benedict Anderson's term.
[103] This spelling is Milton's within the text. Scholars offer alternate spellings, like Rudwin's, "Pandemonium." I defer to the scholar when citing their work, but otherwise default to Milton's spelling.

scholarly topics. In the last few decades, there has been a resurgence in examining Milton's works through a nationalistic lens such as David Loewenstein in *Representing Revolution in Milton and his Contemporaries* (2001) and Loewenstein and Paul Stevens's edited collection, *Early Modern Nationalism and Milton's England* (2008). Satan's origin is also a popular focus of scholarship, most notably Neil Forsyth's works *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth* (1987) and *The Satanic Epic* (2003).

This chapter is not concerned with revisiting these well-covered topics or in analyzing Satan's shapeshifting or the ways in which his presentation conforms to the popular understanding of the devil as an animalistic, dark, shapeshifting, tempting figure, or the books of *Paradise Lost* that support that popular reading. Instead, I focus on the elements of the epic that counter popular narratives of the devil: his devilish leadership, his diabolical rebellions, and the two infernal councils. Revisiting each of these concepts from the earlier chapters of this dissertation allows me to analyze Satan in the context of political devil figures throughout English literature and how these figures make statements about English national identity. Therefore, this chapter is both a microcosm of, and the culmination of, the dissertation, arguing that Satan's leadership is devilish because it is a perversion of heavenly, and good leadership; his speech and rebellion is diabolical because it taints and infects other angels; and the two infernal councils represent an inversion of power which end up accomplishing the opposite of what was intended. This chapter also evokes the first one, as Milton knew Malmesbury, and used *Gesta* as a model for his own work, particularly *The History of Britain* (1670). As Rozaliya Yaneva argues, these elements of carnival ultimately reinforce authority (Yaneva 58). Whereas *Þe Deulis Perlament*, *1 Henry IV*, and *Macbeth* are reflections of

cultural fears, desires, and anxieties, Milton, like William of Malmesbury, is more consciously constructing *Paradise Lost* as the vehicle for the tensions and anxieties of England after the Restoration, concerned about abuses of power, and how to provide role models that can guide good, Christian English people during this turbulent time. Like Malmesbury, he presents a particular, imagined community of England; a vision of the English nation is created simply by writing it so. Milton's nation is a strong, whole, Christian nation, led by faith, and holy role models, not fallible men who might lead the nation astray. These concepts also work as binaries—devilish leaders are paired with role models of good leadership, rebels are paired with loyal soldiers and angels, and the infernal councils are paired with the heavenly councils that inspired them.[104] The imagined community of Pandæmonium becomes a "symbolic construct" (Loewenstein and Stevens 175), a simulacrum of the real, heaven.

History of *Paradise Lost*

Before we turn to the larger nationalistic arguments Satan makes in *Paradise Lost*, we must first consider the context of the publication of *Paradise Lost* as it impacts my argument.[105] The most important aspect of the differences in the editions for this

---

[104] There are several scholars whose work compares and/or lists sources and analogues for Milton's infernal councils such as Mason Hammond's 1933 "'Concilia Deorum' from Homer through Milton," David Quint's 2014 *Inside "Paradise Lost": Reading the Designs of Milton's Epic,* Joseph Wittreich's 1983 "'All Angelic Natures Joined in One': Epic Convention and Prophetic Interiority in the Council Scenes of Paradise Lost," and Colleen Donnelly's 1986 "The Syntactic Counterplot of the Devils' Debates and God's Council."

[105] Michael Bryson argues that "the 1667*Paradise Lost* does all the same work that the 1674 version does" ("Mysterious" 183). Certainly, one of the biggest differences in reading and understanding the context of these two works are the very distinctive historical and cultural moments of each edition. The first edition comes "after the plague of 1665 and the devastating fires of September 1666, and after the conclusion reached by

dissertation is the 1674 edition displaces Satan from the central position, which refocuses the text's concerns over English nationalism. David Quint argues that expanding the 1674 edition into twelve-books "changes the center of the poem so that Books 6 and 7 depict the double heroism of the Son as victor over Satan and as cosmic creator" (234). He also states that this refocusing also moves the center of the epic away from Satan's actions, instead relocating Satan's actions to the margin of the epic. Per Quint, this shift means that Milton was not "of the Devil's party without knowing it" as William Blake claimed. This shift also means that Satan is not the center or hero of the epic as many readers wish him to be. I argue that this move makes the infernal councils of Books 2 and 10 become frameworks for a story refocused on the true purpose of the epic. The Son is introduced in Book 3, right after the first infernal council. Adam and Eve's banishment from Eden in Books 11-12 after the second infernal council lays the foundation for the Son's purpose on Earth, the redemption of mankind. This refocusing places the emphasis on the defeat of Satan and the restoration of order, not the rebellion.

---

many that the disasters were the judgment of God upon a debauched and dissolute nation" (Bryson, "Mysterious" 184). Changes to the text begin within a year of the first publication indicating that "the text was deemed to lack sufficient clarity or logical organization" (Bjork 10). The biggest change between editions are the alterations in the *Arguments*, both in the wording and the purpose where "the synopses became part of the central text" (Bjork 51-2). Allen H. Gilbert argues that the changes to the *Arguments* may also reflect more of Milton's original intent, basing them on original outlines now lost (qtd. in Bjork 54). While not central to my argument, there is quite a bit of scholarship on *Paradise Lost's* initial reception such as Nicholas von Maltzahn's "The First Reception of *Paradise Lost* (1667)." Michael Lieb and John T. Shawcross argue that the 1667 edition is both important in its own right and for how it results in the latter edition. In fact, Lieb's chapter in this collection, "Back to the Future: *Paradise Lost* 1667" posits that the 1674 edition cannot be fully understood without the context of the 1667 first edition. Joseph Wittreich's chapter in this same collection "'More and More Perceiving': Paraphernalia and Purpose, 1668, 1669" adds to this discussion by viewing the editions as a process, an ongoing conversation.

Barker argues that the new twelve-book models breaks down into the following parts; Books 1-4 focus on Satan, his journey to Eden, and temptation of Eve; the next four books "explain Satan to Adam; they centre on Christ; the last four show the Fall and its consequences, centering on Adam and Eve" (Hale 134). According to this structure in the second edition, Satan is the inciting incident but is no longer the focus of the epic, supporting Quint's reading and mine. While the old ten-book structure emphasized Satan's influence and the fall creating a "Satan-centered by a structural inadvertence," Milton corrects this misreading in the 1674 edition (Hale 132). Certainly, the 1674 edition "appeared in print essentially in the form the poem had come to imagine it" (Mor and Luxon lviii). The second edition is also Milton's final control and say on the subject, written through the lens of his decision "to write a sequel" (Hale 137), *Paradise Regained,* and some would argue, *Samson Agonistes* (1671).[106] While *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes* (1671)[107] are very different texts in genre and character treatment, they do share the theme of redemption. *Paradise Regained* is subtitled "The recovery of men" and both texts can be read as models for how the English moving forward at the end of the seventeenth century when so much remains uncertain.

Satan in *Paradise Lost* further complicates the popular understanding of the English devil and combines the elements of the English political devil portrayals we've seen in Chapters One through Three. Whereas the English devil is usually understood to

---

[106] While *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes* are very different texts they are printed together, and therefore are often read as differing perspectives on the same topic, redemption.

[107] For more on the importance of these texts see Angelica Duran's 2000 "The Last Stages of Education: *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes.*"

be dark in color, with animalistic physical traits, conveying marks of alterity, *Paradise Lost* keeps these ideas of differences but revises the presentation.[108] From the opening of Book 1, Satan is presented as altern but situates him amongst classical and Biblical monsters such Briareos and Typhon (1.199), Leviathan (1.201), and comparing him to the Titans (1.198) held in Tarsus (1.200) rather than demonic figures. *Paradise Lost's* Satan does tempt and deceive Eve but his ultimate manipulation and betrayal in the epic is his betrayal of God and his fellow angels. While Satan's individual and personal actions against Eve are important, this dissertation is more interested in analyzing previously ignored subjects such as Satan's role as a devilish leader, his rebellious speech, and rebellion against institutions, and the role of infernal councils as a reflection of the political nature of the English devil.

Satan is most often read as a criticism of the monarchy, but he is also an object lesson in the dangers of bad leadership. The devil is rarely praised or presented as a leader; rather, minor devils are often the ones shown in roles of underlings and minions with devilish leadership only implied. If the devil is depicted with any power, it is usually only over other demons and occasionally control over sinful humans. In many ways, this portrayal mitigates the threat the devil presents by limiting his power. Using Satan for the name of the devil in *Paradise Lost* is an interesting choice, as Satan is generally not understood to be the leader in hell. Beelzebub is often presented as the leader, having led "a revolution against the ancient leader of the rebel angels and wrested the crown and scepter from him" (Rudwin, "Pandemonium" 464). Likewise, medieval plays place

---

[108] It is worth noting though that the first illustrated edition of *Paradise Lost* in 1688 portrays Satan in line with the common understanding, as a dark, animalistic figure.

Lucifer as the king of hell (465), while Judaic and Arabic traditions name Samael and Eblis as the sovereign in hell (466). Milton's choice of name offers a mythology for Satan that is distinct from the hierarchy and explanations we have seen in medieval literature, such as *Þe Deulis Perlament. Paradise Lost* uses Lucifer from Isaiah 14:12, "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!" and Satan from Job, where his role in the court of heaven as the Adversary is also his name, and in Maccabees where his role as a rebel also defines him. The choice of Lucifer to represent the devil before the fall *Paradise Lost* invokes Biblical authority of source material and emphasizes all that was lost in the fall, while the choice of Satan after the fall highlights his political and rebellious nature, and his inevitable defeat.

While rebellion is often understood as part of the devil's origin story, it rarely plays an active role in devil narratives in English literature. Yet as we saw in Chapter Three rebellion is always diabolical. Rebellion is often described as the inciting incident of the fall but is almost never presented as a current concern. Placing rebellion in the safer historical past may have been a conscious choice on Milton's part to navigate his precarious position after the Restoration and a way to get the epic past the censers. His decision to feature an infernal council that reads as a critique of Parliament but never names itself as such may function in a similar manner. In the years after the English Civil War, rebellion was still a fresh concern, something best left in the distant past, presented as a solved problem. The *York Corpus Christi* and *N-Town* plays dramatize the rebellion as the cause of the fall but firmly place these actions in the past, not the present. Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century pamphlets are an exception as they present rebellion

as a current concern, explicitly invoking the image and name of the devil on covers of pamphlets that addressed fears and anxieties over rebellion.[109] Yet their devil is the visually different one, not human, thus the older visual rhetoric of the medieval devil provides some distance. In *Paradise Lost*, Satan's rebellion is the consequence of his devilish speech and leadership, both of which lead to the formation of the infernal councils. Post-Restoration rebellion was still a dangerous topic so Satan's rebellion is contained within Raphael's narrative on the consequences of rebellion in Books 5 and 6. This allows the reader, and Adam, to both acknowledge the danger it represented, learn

---

[109] The following pamphlets link the devil and rebellion in the title: *The English devil: or, Cromwel and his monstrous witch discover'd at White-Hall: With the strange and damnable speech of this hellish monster, by way of revelation, touching king and kingdom; and a narrative of the infernal plots, inhumane actings, and barbarous conspiracies of this grand impostor, and most audacious rebel, that durst aspire from a brew-house to the throne, washing his accursed hands in the blood of his royal soveraign; and trampling over the heads of the most loyal subjects, making a foot-ball of a crown, and endeavouring utterly to extirpate the royal progeny, root and kinde, stem and stock* (London, 1660), *The black and terrible vvarning piece: or, a scourge to Englands rebellion. Truly representing, the horrible iniquity of the times; the dangerous proceedings of the ranters, and the holding of no Resurrection by the shakers, in Yorkshire and elsewhere. With the several judgements of the most high and eternal Lord God, upon all usurpers, who deny His law, and His truth; and the manner how 130 children were taken away by the devil, and never seen no more; and divers others taken, rent, torn, and cast up and down from room to room, by strange and dreadfull spirits, appearing in the shapes of, a black boar, a roaring lyon, an English statesman, and a Roman fryer. Extracted out of the elaborate works of Bishop Hall, and Sir Kenelm Digby; and published for general satisfaction, to all Christian princes, states, and common-wealths in Europe* (London, 1653), *The devil's an asse: or, the policy of hell made plain to the dwellers on earth Being a serious reflection upon the late inhumane rebellious warr. Wherein is laid open the folly as well as wickednesse of that horrid sin of rebellion. By T. B.* (London, 1660), *Grand Plutoes remonstrance, or, The Devill horn-mad at Roundheads and Brownists. Wherein his Hellish Maiestie (by advice of his great counsell, Eacus, Minos & Radamanthus, with his beloved brethren, Agdistis, Beliall, Incubus & Succubus) is pleased to declare, 1. How far he differs from Round-head, rattle-head, or prickeare. 2. His copulation with a holy sister. 3. His decre [sic] affection to romish Catholikes, and hate to Protestants. 4. His oration to the rebells* (London, 1642).

from it, then dismiss it as no longer a threat. The reader knows that Satan's cause will ultimately be defeated, and God and the Son will be victorious. Even within the epic, the rebellion is not the focus, just the inciting incident, with the rebellion itself is safely contained in the middle of the epic. Some of this may be attributed to the nature of the epic beginning *in medias res,* but I also argue that this is a conscious choice and construction on Milton's part.

In Chapters One through Three of this dissertation, English national identity is commonly defined against *feindbilder*, a common enemy who is different from the majority. In Chapter One, the English people create their national identity against the devilish leaders who betray the people and the English nation. In Chapter Two they distinguish their English national identity against the demonic, democratic parliament. In Chapter Three England is imagined against the rebels who challenge the divine authority of the monarchy. These rebels who incite rebellion through their speech betray their lord for personal reasons which quickly move onto larger national stages. In each case, a role model or hero is presented as the mechanism to restore order. We can read *Paradise Lost* through these lenses—commentary on the dangers of devilish leaders, their demonic speech, the construction and advisement of infernal councils, and diabolical rebels, safely distanced from the troubles of the English Civil War and the Restoration. In *Paradise Lost* we also see more overlap and slippage between these elements as Satan's devilish leadership is inseparable from his demonic speech which leads to rebellion, and the infernal council that is inseparable from both.

If Anderson's idea of nationalism is an imagined community, *Paradise Lost* presents two different imagined communities: Satan's simulacra construction of

Pandæmonium in hell and the original structures and creations of heaven. Therefore, *Paradise Lost's* nationalism is defined by absence, the absence of both the heavenly structure and of the missing fallen. Loewenstein and Stevens argue that despite historical differences between the medieval and early modern periods, that "Early modern nationalism is defined by what it is not" (3). We would expect to see the ethnically and visually different devil, more in line with the common understanding of the English devil in *Paradise Lost* for the angels and Adam and Eve to define themselves against. However, the epic though is less concerned with appearances than words and actions and the argument they present about the republic, monarchy, and tyranny. Despite the historical moment, where England's alterns of Welsh, Scots, and Irish[110] figured predominantly during the English Civil War, *Paradise Lost* ignores the challenges they presented to English nationalism in the early modern period by having the fallen stand in for all threats and through the epic's Biblical, prelapsarian setting (Loewenstein and Stevens 161). The epic similarly sidesteps the potential religious threats to nationalism by not naming, or conforming to, any one theology. In addition to being defined by absence, English nationalism, as we have seen throughout this dissertation, has historically been marked through negation, "Similitude and conditionality both are forms of negation. And negation is the prime means by which Milton expresses the features of hell" (Achinstein 217). England is England because it is not under devilish leadership, guided by infernal councils or plagued by diabolic rebellions. Within the epic, the heavenly host is holy

[110] Catherine Canino's "The Discourse of Hell: *Paradise Lost* and the Irish Rebellion" analyzes this absence. Likewise, the works of Christopher Hill, Meritt Y. Hughes, and Paul N Siegel not only read Scotland onto *Paradise Lost,* but make specific connections between Macbeth and Satan.

because of the absence of the fallen, the loyal angels defined by contrast to their fallen brethren.

Paradise Lost's **Nationalism**

Epics as a genre serve nationalistic interests. As we've seen chronicles such as *Gesta* can serve nationalistic interests by writing the nation they wish to see. The nationalistic objectives of *Þe Deulis Perlament, 1 Henry IV,* and *Macbeth* are not as conscious and therefore can be harder to discern. To understand *Paradise Lost* in context, we have to understand what nationalistic interests Milton is serving with his epic. His *Of Education* reveals that he believes an educated populace is necessary for a strong nation. He believes that the choice between good and bad leaders should be clear, "The treacheries of sedition, then, are practiced not by "those Worthies" (*CPW* 3:192). Milton states that he does not trust the political structures from the English Civil War, both Parliament and the "Military Council- who have been carrying out a godly republican revolution and establishing a new order" (Loewenstein 185). While *Paradise Lost* presents the Son as the only capable of defeating demonic influences, in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (1650), Milton advocates for action as a requirement of the citizenry in the face of tyranny, making it the responsibility of all to act. For Milton, moving against a tyrant was not only allowed but a requirement for a thriving English nation, "We may from hence with more ease and force of argument determine what a tyrant is and what the people may do against him" (Milton 283). The "force of argument" combines the strength of rhetoric with the martial actions necessary to back up the rhetoric while the word choice, "may do" emphasizes the importance, and risk, of choice. Similar to the argument made by the end of the epic, In *Defensio Secunda* (1654) Milton

argues that God is the only hope for the English nation. While education and the ability to reason are presented as key elements to England's success Milton worries that England will not prove worthy, or fit so God becomes the deciding factor. By 1660, the year of the restoration of the monarchy, and just four years before the first edition of *Paradise Lost,* Milton provides a clear vision of how he envisions the commonwealth in *The Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth.* He stresses the relationship between "religion and civil liberties" (Milton 331), with words such as "covenant" (Milton 331-2), and "rebellion" (Milton 331) calling to mind both demonic and godly pacts as well as the devil's original rebellion. He conflates the religious term "covenant" with the political language of rebellion in order to argue that the two are inseparable. After the Restoration Milton sidesteps the potential issues of privileging one over the other by making them the same thing. Therefore, all threats to the nation and Protestantism become demonic threats. Milton's nationalism is not dependent on individuals such as Charles or Cromwell, the future instead depends on an educated, faith based community that rejects dangerous structures and ideals.

Devilish Leadership

John Milton's *History of Britain* covers events up to 1066, and he confessed that it was a conscious reworking of William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum* and *Chronicle of the Kings of England.* Milton states that Malmesbury was one of the greatest historians (Lewalski 652) and uses him as a model, seeing his own national project as an outgrowth of William's. In *Paradise Lost* we can see a connection between how devilish leadership is portrayed and contrasted with good leadership role models, recalling the Mirror of Princes genre. Both texts define good leaders against traits seen in devilish

leaders—corruption, arrogance, vice. Within *Paradise Lost*, Satan is described as, and shown to be, the devilish leader (a literal devil-leader), the poor choice, who is contrasted against the ultimately good role model of the Son. Both Milton and Malmesbury consciously rework history to present a specific narrative of English nationalism.

Given the post-English Civil War and post-Restoration time period, any conversation on leadership should be read through the lens of the recent historical examples of bad leadership in the form of Charles I and Oliver Cromwell. In 1649, Charles I pays the ultimate price for his poor leadership with his execution. While Oliver Cromwell was initially seen as a good leader, the answer and antidote to the contaminated leadership of Charles I, he too is ultimately revealed to be an evil leader. In both cases, England suffers as a result. Satan is often read as representative of Oliver Cromwell, tyrants known for their deception and betrayals. Cromwell betrays the Republican cause and his betrayal, his grab for power, and his ambition, construct him as demonic. Within the epic, Satan also betrays those he should be loyal to, and it is his grab for power, and ambition which confirms his demonic nature. Satan is a wicked and devilish leader because he infects, threatens, then damages the structures of heaven. Satan takes on the titles and trappings of power[111] but cannot create anything except mimicry in

---

[111] *Paradise Lost* makes no direct references to Catholicism, but certainly after the Reformation descriptions of trappings, titles, and a focus on material things invokes images of Catholicism and these images would have invoked recent fears of Catholic threat seen in Charles I's marriage to Henrietta. For more on this, see Vladimir Brljak's 2015 "Early Comments on Milton's Anti-Trinitarianism," Clement Fatovic's 2005 "The Anti-Catholic Roots of Liberal and Republican Conceptions of Freedom in English Political Thought," Andrew Hadfield's 2007 "Milton and Catholicism," Arthur Marotti's 1999 *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts*, Emma Schrader's 1909 *The Divina Commedia and Paradise Lost Reflect Mediaevalism and the*

hell, revealing his lack of true power and authority. He ultimately betrays all he once held dear: "In *Paradise Lost* it is the seditious 'plots' of Satan and his powers, furthered by their ambiguous words, which recall rebellious earthly kings and 'Princes in their Congregation'" (Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution* 221). Just as Cromwell is initially set up as a positive role model in contrast to Charles I, Satan is often defined in contrast to others. The epic presents Moloch[112] and Gabriel as military role models by describing them as classical military generals.[113] Abdiel, Gabriel, Raphael, and Michael are models for the remaining angelic host, those that stayed faithful to God and heaven (Swaim 182). Moloch is a great general but despite being presented as a better choice for leadership in Book 2's infernal council, it is Satan's deception and not Moloch's merit is rewarded. The angelic role models all earn their places through loyalty, and military service. Ultimately, only the Son is the true role model of good leadership because of his merit, his divine status, and his infallibility.

Satan's leadership is constructed as demonic in the same ways we saw in Chapter One and Three; he is a bad leader who can potentially contaminate the larger political

---

Renaissance, Catholicism and Protestantism, and David Walker's 2010 "Militant Religion and Politics in the Holy War."

[112] Milton uses two spellings, "Moloc" (2.43) and "Moloch" (1.392, 417) to refer to the same figure within the epic.

[113] In 2014's *Inside Paradise Lost: Reading the Designs of Milton's Epic,* David Quint argues that Moloch is a classical presentation of a "soldier" (42), and that the epic's presentation of "Moloch as old-fashioned martial hero is contrasted with Beelzebub, the smooth strategist" (44). Quint's argument is that this presentation "parodies" the classical Achilles/Ulysses relationship (44). In Robert C. Fox's 1972 "The Character of Moloch in Paradise Lost" he argues that while Moloch is foolhardy, he is also bold (389), and fulfills many of the elements of true courage as defined by Aristotle, and demonstrates passion (391). While Moloch is not a hero, as Quint argues, his description and presentation is certainly meant to invoke these classical ideas.

structure and people, the nation of heaven through demonic speech and rebellion. He is also demonic because he counters the true authority of heaven, God, and the Son, the natural order and monarchy. His deceptive, equivocating speech leads angels into civil war against other angels revealing the perversion of the speech. The demonic technology he creates for this war is also a perversion of the true nature of angels and the divine, machines that destroy and do not create.[114] According to Björn Weiler's definitions used in Chapter One, the job of a good leader is "maintaining the peace; defending the realm; practicing piety, founding, endowing or re-establishing monastic houses, ensuring that not a whiff of simony poised the English church and upholding justice" (7). Satan starts a war disrupting the peace of heaven and attacking the heavenly realm. The building of Pandæmonium is the inverse of building religious houses, and Satan's motivation for revenge shows he has no interest in justice not least of all because as we see at the end of the epic, justice does not work in Satan's favor. One way leaders are historically constructed as demonic is for their ability to deceive, lead others astray, and foment rebellion. Devilish leaders purposely guide their followers into misunderstandings and misreadings that placate the collective and solidify the power base of the leaders. In Chapter Three Hotspur is able to convince the nobles to rebel through his speech and Macbeth uses speech to accomplish his coup against Duncan. Both of those figures are named as rebels, which constructs them as demonic because of the threat they represent. Likewise, Satan uses his speech to incite war and rebellion.

---

[114] After Luther, Protestantism moved away from an emphasis on works, depending more on faith. Satan then can be read as showing a lack of faith in post-Lutheran Protestantism. This emphasis on "work" also recalls the devils in *Þe Deulis Parlement* and their imitative "werkes."

Language Constructs the Demonic

As we saw in Chapters Two and Three, how and what constructs speech as demonic changes and evolves. While the devils in *Þe Deulis Perlament* are wrong and misguided in their speech, their speech is constructed as demonic for its democratic, collective nature while Chapter Three constructs speech that equivocates as demonic. The witches may not conform to the idea of the English political devil, but their equivocation through prophecy allows and enables Macbeth's actions. The rebelling nobles in *1 Henry IV* are not ambiguous in their intentions, instead, their speech is constructed as demonic because it results in rebellion. As we also saw in Chapter Three, the definition of equivocation is not inherently negative, meaning only "ambiguity of meaning in words" yet the historical context of its use impacts how it is perceived. Equivocation takes on sinister meanings when placed against the background of political rebellions and assassinations. We can read the historical moment of *Paradise Lost* and its use of equivocation in the same way. I also argue that more so in Chapter Four than Three, the second part of equivocation's definition is important, the "misapprehension arising from the ambiguity of terms" (*OED).* It is not just whether or not a figure, devilish or not, meant for their speech to be ambiguous but also how the reader or audience receives this speech. If the speech creates anxiety in the audience, the receiver, then what the speaker meant is not the only defining aspect of equivocation. One thing that differentiates equivocation from deception, and devilish figures' use of it in the early modern versus the medieval period is how importance is constructed. Deception presents one side, one narrative, that is a lie. Equivocation is a form of deception, but implies intent to deceive specifically through the use of language. Equivocation is also a form of self-deception.

Satan does not just deceive the rebelling angels then the fallen, he deceives himself in thinking that he will be able to create a structure and reality that could challenge heaven's. Satan explicitly employs ambiguous language, he knows that his audience can read one thing in his words, while he intends another, so the duplicity also differentiates it from the simpler deception. His words also create a misapprehension in his audience, first the rebelling angels, then the fallen. The confusion caused by his words is not his primary intent, but it is a byproduct, and the non-cohesive state that this creates amongst the fallen is part of the discord that defines them and hell, in contrast to the harmony of heaven.

Satan's speeches within the epic contain the rhetoric of democracy and appeal to the emotions of his audiences. He appeals to the lofty ideals of freedom, encouraging the angels to "cast off this Yoke" (5.786), and be "free" (5.791, 792). He describes a world where they can exist "In freedome equal" (5.797), and where they can all be "equals" (5.796), and have "liberty" (5.793). As we saw in Chapters Two and Three the danger of speech is that it is often directed at people who are unfit, misread, misunderstand and are easily incited into rebellion. Speech is an act of creation, akin to storytelling and verbal manipulation of the audience. Like *Þe Deulis Perlament*, Satan's narrative, the rhetoric he uses, is the only creation he is capable of. God's creation through words, *logos,* is true creation, but the devil's words, his equivocation, that are intended to deceive cannot be creation and like his rebellion is doomed to fail. His speech, his narrative, tells his side of the story and by doing so rewrites history. Like all demonic creations in the end it is revealed as a fraud.

Satan's speech deceives the angels and leads them astray through equivocation. His ambiguity and verbal equivocation[115] (Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution* 187, 197) construct the concept of speech as demonic within the epic. Ambiguity was also seen as dangerous for the ways it could be used and misused in political rhetoric (Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution* 206). Certainly, in the public imagination there was the understanding that duplicitous speech and ambiguous language, both associated with Charles I before and during the English Civil War, was demonic (Loewenstein 191). Just as Charles I's words were duplicitous, so too were Cromwell's later words and his betrayal of the cause understood as verbal fraud (Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution* 209). Neither Charles nor Cromwell were "consistent in his political discourse" (Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution* 217), a signifier that they were devilish leaders.

These concepts are connected in Book 6 where Satan is described as the "Author of evil" (6.262). It is Satan's actions that allow evil to come into the war, evil that was "unknown till thy revolt," (6.263). While it is not revealed until the end of the epic, these descriptions of Satan as author are ultimately revealed to be false as Satan's narrative is observed and told by God.[116] In Chapter Two, we saw that the act of naming was an act of creation, therefore one is "Unnam'd" because one is not wholly created. Evil is created through naming, and Satan is the vehicle and progenitor of evil:

> Unnam'd n Heav'n, now pleneous, as thou seest

---

[115] As Shapiro argues in *The Year of Lear,* verbal equivocation in the sixteenth-century "was diabolical" (166).

[116] God in medieval works is often referred to as the Master Author, as creation is a literary endeavor or affects literary endeavors. For more on this see Anita Obermeier's 1999 *The History and Anatomy of Auctorial Self-Criticism in the European Middle Ages* and Stephen Partridges and Erik Kwakkell's 2012 *Author, Reader, Book: Medieval Authorship in Theory and Practice.*

> These Acts of hateful strife, hateful to all,
>
> Though heaviest by just measure on thy self
>
> And thy adherents: how hast thou disturb'd
>
> Heav'ns blessed peace, and into Nature brought
>
> Miserie, uncreated till the crime
>
> Of thy Rebellion? (6.262-9)

Satan's legacy is that evil is now out in the world, a force that his actions allowed to be created but is now loose, and acting on its own in the world. Through his rebellion, Satan has committed "Acts" that "disturb's / Heav'ns blessed peace" and peaceful purpose. He has disrupted the natural order and perverted it by bringing things into the world that should not exist such as "Miserie." Devilish leaders, demonic speech, and diabolic rebellion all seek to counter the natural order and authority of the monarchy and the stability of the nation.

Many of Satan's victories are temporary because they are always based on deception and fall apart under examination. Many of Satan's traits focus on his ability to deceive. He deceives when he shapeshifts, either into animal form or to appear as a human. He deceives with his words, promising things to people, often using deceptive words to seduce. His words lead people away from God, and doing what is right. In his role as a devilish leader it is his actions and his words that deceive. Satan's equivocation, his deception through words, and how they tempt and seduce others into acting against God, is one of the main things that constructs him as demonic. In turn, his equivocation is not only demonic in and of itself but is also demonic because it counters God's authority and his symbolism as the head of a state and the power it represents.

> Since equivocation encourages doubt, and doubt signifies evidence of Satan's work and further opportunity for Satan to undermine order and goodness; equivocation was seen as a threat to cosmic structures, moral authority, and societal coherence, which is to say, state power. (Reynolds 19)

The first item on Satan's agenda when he addresses the assembled devils (1.645-46) is to deceive the fallen. He uses "fraud and guile" (1.646) and "guile" (2.41) to accomplish his goals. Satan's equivocation is seen in Book 2 with the presentation of power. Satan's equivocation in Book 2 foreshadows his actions in Book 9 where the victims are the same, as are his tactics. Book 2's long debate reaffirms Satan's recommendation to further use fraud (2.345-80), an irony to the reader, if lost on the fallen (Camino 18). "In Book III, Satan is determined to pervert man using "false guile" and "glozing lies" (3.89-92)." (Camino 18). In Book 3 and 4 Satan's equivocation is through his shape which fools Uriel (3.636) but which Gabriel can see through (4.1005), like Abdiel, Gabriel's faith and loyalty allow him to counter Satan's equivocation and heresy, thus further identifying Gabriel as a role model to other angels and the reader/audience. Satan further deceives the angels in Book 5.

Part of what constructs Satan's equivocation as demonic is the fact that the goal of his use is to destabilize first the harmony of heaven, and then to prevent the fallen from mimicking the stability of heaven in hell. Satan's deception through speech highlights the destabilizing potential of language. In Book 5 Satan equivocates to the angels to undermine the structure and authority of the Son and God and lead the angels astray. He suggests "Heaven is a tyrannical realm" (Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution* 223). In

Book 5, Satan's role as a devilish leader is tied to his speech: "Rhetoric is obviously one of the causes of the fall" (Agari 542). This speech then leads to actions that are a "fraud" (5.880) that deceives the fallen. The ambiguous nature of Satan words is what makes them equivocation, which in turn taints and infects the angels, "casts between / Ambiguous words and jealousies to sound / Or taint integritie" (5.702-4). He uses his speech to manipulate the angels "with lyes / Drew after him the third part of Heav'ns Host" (5.709-10). Here, the text identifies Satan's words as "lyes." While Satan's words may deceive the angels, they cannot deceive the narrator who can see the truth.

In Book 6 Satan's equivocation is a rejection of law, order, and God's authority. His words do not just challenge God's authority but he also mocks it, "So scoffing in ambiguous words" (568). Satan's lies, his equivocation, and his ambiguous language is all demonic and is innately tied to the "ambiguous forms of rebellion and sedition that Milton confronted during the crises of the Revolution" (Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution* 177). Devilish leaders use equivocation to deceive their people and foment political rebellion. Within the historical context of the poem there are clearly understood connections between the language Republicans used, how this was seen as leading to betrayal, and its inherently demonic nature,

> That Satan is a king does not prevent him from using the republican political discourse used by Milton and other supporters of the good old cause. Like monarchial forms of government, this discourse is not a bearer of evil in itself but can become so by being appropriated by an evil agent. (Walker 291-2)

In addition to political context, equivocation was also linked to heresy (Loewenstein, *Treacherous Faith* 315). Pallister argues that Satan's equivocation during Eve's temptation represents "the art of satanic fallacy" and illustrates "how satanic rhetoric abuses rhetoric" (204). Not everything Satan says is a lie, but everything he says is a form of deception meant to further his own aims. In Book 7 Satan's speeches have convinced "All like himself rebellious" (140) to follow him "into fraud" (143). He deceives them through speech and because his words are a fraud, so too are all the actions that come after. In Book 9 Satan's fraud, his deceptive speech is his "fraudulent temptation" (531, 532-48) of Eve. Because his speech is demonic and not true it is doomed to fail. This is not to say that there are not true consequences because of his speech or that his fraud is not dangerous.

Satan's speech, his lies, equivocation, and ambiguous language are the tools at his disposal to lead the angels into rebellion. Satan subtly manipulates the angels through ambiguity stating that "each of the angels enjoys the same degree of freedom" and then avows that "Ye are God's equals; if less in power and splendour, yet equal in freedom" (Agari 552). Satan deceives here by changing both the meanings of words and by shifting his focus within the speech: "Satan changes the meanings of *equal* so quickly from 'in the same *degree*' in 'Equally free' to 'the same in *rank*' in 'In freedom equal.'" The result is not only that the angels cannot grasp his logic (Agari 553) but that the construction of Satan's speech does not allow debate or questioning. There is no dialogue, no debate, as we saw in *ÞDP*. Satan's ambiguous language conceals the truth of the consequences of their rebellion and allows Satan to avoid committing himself along to the actions, and makes the others *complicit* in the rebellion. The same equivocation

that causes the angels' fall (Agari 553) is also what proves which angels are loyal. Abdiel, is "logical and faithful" and so it able to resist Satan's language, and therefore his rebellion (Agari 554). Throughout the epic "Satan frames and reframes his own rebellion against God in specifically allusive language" (Slaska-Sapala, *Paradise Lost* 4). In Chapter Two, we saw that the devils' telling their narrative was the only form of creation they were capable of. Likewise, we can read Satan's speeches, his manipulation of words as an attempt to "usurp and imitate words" of God (Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution* 207), to tell his own version of reality, his own narrative and attempt to remake the truth. The reader knows this is a false narrative even if Satan does not. The simulacrum can never replace the real, it can only ever replicate itself, with each replication getting further and further away from the real, less and less of a true copy each time (Baudrillard 6).

Satan not only deceives through his speech and leads the fallen astray but his betrayal of the fallen is a personal betrayal. He promises equality and freedom but then sets himself "above his Peers" (1.39). The other fallen are described as Satan's crew and his peers, yet he betrays the ideals he used to first persuade them to rebel. In reality, the Peers are presented "as Satan's rivals" (Caswell 52). The contrast between Satan's titles and the anonymous fallen function the same way. Even when he argues for equality he describes himself through titles whereas the majority of the fallen are not named, let alone granted titles. There is similar contradictory information about the hierarchy of the fall in this same section of Book 6 when Satan says he "His Potentates to Councel call'd by night" (6.416). Potentates means monarchs or rulers which would seem to refer to the fallen introduced in the infernal council in Book 2 by name, the fallen like Moloch and

Belial who are described as much as fallen gods as fallen angels, therefore worthy of these titles. Yet even these fallen and not the collective, anonymous fallen are not equal to Satan. The titles are a lie, a verbal fraud the epic perpetuates.

Satan's deceptive language results in rebellion, the action that goes on to define him and the rest of the fallen. Their naming is tied to their actions. Many of the fallen are never given names instead described only for their collective status, as "Rebel Thrones" (6.199). Later in Book 6, rebellion is used as an identifier equal to their angelic status. Likewise, it is their rebellion that makes them "Foes" to God and the Son (3.677) and causes God to make mankind to replace them, "to repair that loss / Created this new happie Race of Men / To serve him better" (3.678-680). As historically the devil was defined by his adversarial purpose so too are the fallen angels now defined by what they fight against, "there incited them to rebel with them." They are now defined but what they have done, not who they are, or were. At the end of the epic, this also provides the mechanism for the restoration of order, and Adam and Eve's salvation.

Infernal Councils

Paradise Lost's infernal councils in Books 2 and 10 conform to James Frederic Cool's structure that we saw in Chapter Two. In *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader,* Sharon Achinstein's culminating chapter, "Milton and the Fit Reader: *Paradise Lost and the Parliament of Hell"* situates the two infernal councils in the epic within this larger genre, popular during the seventeenth century. Achinstein's reading helps us understand the infernal councils within their historical context. As we have seen, Satan is inherently

a political figure. These infernal councils were a favorite trope in Royalist pamphlets,[117] as they allowed writers to avoid issues with the censors (Achinstein 179) once Parliament's Treason Act in 1649 made writing against the government treason (Achinstein 177). In these Royalist tracts, Charles was God and Parliament the Devil (Achinstein 180) like the construction we saw in Chapter Two. After the execution of Charles I, Parliament is constructed as demonic because it has countered the natural order and because Parliament is full of devils (Achinstein 192).

Read through this allegorical lens, Satan's political nature in *Paradise Lost* reflects how the devil as a political figure is flexible enough to change and adapt to reflect the historical and cultural moment. "Satan was, variously, the Catholic church, the sects, Parliament, Cromwell, or an assortment of other historical figures" (Achinstein 181). While the genre of the parliament of hell was used predominately by Royalists, as we see in *Paradise Lost,* anti-Royalists used the genre to make their own arguments. After the Restoration writers tried to "justify the return of the king by construing the Interregnum leaders as agents of the Devil" (Achinstein 194). In many ways, this lets

---

[117]The 1644 *The Devills White Boyes* "suggested that the king was being led astray from devilish, Catholic, "Malignant," counselors" (Achinstein 184) a danger we saw in Chapter One. In 1647, *The Devil in His Dumps* contrasts "the Devil's kingdom and England" (Achinstein 183). *The Cuckoo's Nest at Westminster* (1648) describes Parliament as full of "Traitors and Rebels" and just before and following Charles I's execution, pamphlets moved from showing Parliament as guided by the devil to placing Satan directly in Parliament (Achinstein 187). *The Devill and the Parliament* (1648) goes so far as to accuse Parliament as having made a deal with the devil (Achinstein 188) while in *A Declaration of Great Lucifer, Prince of the Air, and of Devils, and of all the damned crew in Hell* (1648) the devil calls Parliament his servants (Achinstein 190). *News from Hell* (1660) "relates hell's reaction to the Restoration in political, not moral, terms" (Achinstein 197).

certain people off the hook by framing their actions as inevitable because no one could resist the power of the devil.

Just as we have seen bad leadership, manipulative speech and equivocation, and rebellion constructed as demonic, after the Restoration "false counselors, a hellish cabal, and deceptive writing" are also constructed as demonic (Achinstein 195). These elements are inherently political and as Achinstein notes in *Paradise Lost,* are inherently Royalist. "In finding Interregnum leaders were satanic, Milton puts himself in the same camp as the Royalists" (Achinstein 204). As with the decision to set critiques of the monarchy in the safe historical, prelapsarian past, so too this decision to invoke the mostly Royalist genre of the Parliament of Hell, may have been a move to satisfy Royalist readers and avoid issues with the censors (Achinstein 201). In addition to this, Milton's other writings support his presentation of Parliament as demonic. His *History of Britain* (1670) and *Character of the Long Parliament* (1681) both construct Parliament as demonic (Achinstein 205). Milton ultimately blames the Parliament as the representative of the ill educated people, not his "fit audience" for the failures of England (Achinstein 209). This context is important because even though historical scholarship clearly places *Paradise Lost's* infernal councils in this context, Milton does not use "Parliament" to describe the infernal councils in the epics. He prefers "counsel" (Book 2 Argument); "counsel" as a noun to represent what the devils form (2.506), as a verb in that the devils "counsel" him (2.20, 115, 125, 160, 227, 279, 304, 379, 10.920, 10.944. 10.1010) and "council" (10.428) for the structure. Just as I argue in Chapter Two that "Parliament" is purposely used to critique the political structure and the dangers it represents, here I believe Milton avoids it for the same reason. I believe he sets the epic in the safe, historical past, to avoid

problems and dangers associated with critiquing political structures after the Restoration. The devils in *Paradise Lost* must fail at their endeavors, from the leadership level, to the rebellion, to their republican counsels, to reaffirm the natural order and authority, which ultimately rests in God's hands.

Satan's devilish leadership and the subsequent consequences of the rebellion are what leads to the formation of the infernal council. As we saw in Chapter Two parliaments are characterized as demonic in part because they are a democratic collective of voices. There are two infernal councils in *Paradise Lost* that operate very differently from each other. The infernal council in Book 2 lays the foundation for the action of the epic, while the rebellion and war described in Books 5 and 6 explain why the initial infernal council was necessary. The infernal council in Book 10 acts as a microcosm for the epic as a whole as it sets up Satan as a hero, shows the fallen as misguided, and ultimately restores divine order. It highlights the elements of the infernal council, sets Satan up as the center, and moves through Cool's elements. While not an aspect of Cool's work most infernal councils ultimately serves to reinstate the natural order as the infernal council is supplanted by the heavenly one.[118] Book 10's council is ultimately revealed to be a heavenly council, like the council of High Priests in *Christiad II* (Fletcher and Haan xxx) and in Phineas Fletcher's "Locustae" (1611/1627) (Haan 228).

The fallen in *Paradise Lost* are described as a collective from their first appearance in Book 1. One of the first descriptions of the fallen in Book 1 names them as Satan's "horrid crew" (1.51). Later they are described as "the companions of his fall"

---

[118] Oddly enough, portrayals of the Harrowing of Hell that often feature infernal councils rarely present the heavenly councils of which they are poor imitations.

(1.76). Directly after this we get the first naming of the fallen, Beelzebub (1.81) who is named before Satan (1.82). Satan deceptively refers to his fallen as "Mate" (1.192, 1.238) implying there is a parity between them, which Satan reveals to be false in Book 10's infernal council. This collective is named in a litany, "First, Moloch" (1.392), Chemos (1.406), Baalim and Ashtaroth (1.422), Astoreth / Astarte (1.439), Thammuz ((1.452), Dagon (1.462), Rimmon (1.467), Osiris, Isis, Orus (1.478), and Belial "came last" (1.490). While "These were the prime in order and in might" (1.506), they are not the only devils in hell, or Pandæmonium, but these are the named devils that form Satan's infernal council. There are two collectives formed in these councils, the named devils who have the power of speech and the powerless unnamed fallen.

In Chapter Two, *Þe Deulis Parliament* constructs Parliament as demonic in part because of their democratic and collective nature. We see how both physical and political structures the devils adopt are only simulacrum of the heavenly structures they left behind. Rather than existing as new creations these artificial, demonic constructions function in the same vein as carnival, they highlight the real and reinforce the natural authority. As Achinstein's work shows, *Paradise Lost* both invokes and counters these narrative norms of infernal councils. The infernal councils in *Paradise Lost* are inherently political, nominally presented as a way for the fallen to have their voices heard in a way not possible before the fall. These councils are also shown as evidence of their collective nature, which is in keeping with other infernal councils in literature as Cool's work shows. Satan's speeches and actions in these two councils gives credence to this representation. Just as the simulacrum of the infernal council ultimately reinforces the real of heaven, so too does the apparent conformity of *Paradise Lost's* infernal councils

highlight Satan's true purpose. Just as his speech in Book 2 seeks to control the diabolic collective by convincing them they will be happier in their lower station, here we have an example of dissimulation. He pretends to grant the fallen power by listening to their democratic speech and engaging in debate but he manipulates both to achieve his own purpose, to solidify his own power, and ensure he gets what he wants.

Both infernal councils in *Paradise Lost* fulfill all seven key elements of Cool's paradigm; Satan "meditates on his enemies' successes" and his own punishment (1.242-270); next "he stood and call'd / His Legions, Angel Forms" (1.300-1) which gathers the fallen, and then later in Book 1 he calls together the actual council, "thir summons call'd / From every Band and squared Regiment / By place or choice the worthiest" (1.757-9). Just as the listing of Beelzebub, Moloch, and others is a selective list of those allowed in the infernal council, so too is the collective of the fallen limited to only certain named fallen. While the parliament may initially seem democratic, the listing of names, the choice of only some to attend, proves that this collective is not democratic, and that only some can attend and participate. By the end of Book 1, the infernal council is formed, but it is not until Book 2 that the council begins. Satan "delivers a formal speech, explaining the problem," their exile to hell (2.11-42). He then opens the discussion to the others present, "We now debate; who can advise, may speak" (2.42). It is worth noting that while infernal councils are often characterized as demonic because of their democratic nature, there is no democracy built into the elements of the infernal councils. The first to answer, "One or more fiends reply to his speech," Moloch, who argues for "open Warr" (2.51), and whose speech continues through 106), Belial answers "with words cloath'd in reasons garb / Counsell'd ignoble ease, and peaceful sloath, / Not peace" (2.226-8), and

Mammon argues for "peaceful Counsels" (2.279) and "dismissing quite / All thoughts of warr" (2.282-3). Beelzebub is the next to weigh in, and he is the one to come up with the plan for action, arguing that they should focus on finding out more about this "new Race call'd *Man*" (2.348) and then "Seduce them to our Party" (2.368) as "This would surpass / Common revenge, and interrupt his joy / In our Confusion, and our Joy upraise / In his disturbance" (2.370-3). Each of these voices seeks to persuade the majority of the fallen of the righteousness of their argument. It is important to note that each example of demonic speech seeks to incite a specific action from the audience.

While on the surface *Paradise Lost's* infernal councils present a democratic, egalitarian space for speech, there is a strict hierarchy of power. There is no equality amongst the devils or rather the epic presents equality à la *Animal Farm;* all devils are created equal but some are more equal than others. This can be seen in the size of the fallen. The key figures appear larger, which the mostly anonymous masses are smaller demonic figures. Moloch, Belial, Mammon, and Beelzebub are identified by name and set above the rest of the fallen. Satan does not converse with them; rather, he allows them to make one-sided speeches, then ignores them except for stealing Belial's idea. In this way, *Paradise Lost* provides a twist on the last of Cool's elements, "the Devil designates and dispatches a messenger or messengers to carry out this plan" and "the messenger leaves hell, approaches his victim, and attempts to carry out his plan." Satan has fought very hard for power and he is not willing to relinquish it to his "Peers" (1.139). Rather than designate a messenger Satan decides he must be the one to take on Belial's proposed mission, albeit revised to suit his own interests. Satan must take control, be in power, and

he does this is by hijacking Belial's mission and framing his selfish actions as in the best interests of the collective:

> But I should ill become this Throne, O Peers,
> And this Imperial Sov'ranty, adorn'd
> With splendor, arm'd with power, if aught propos'd
> And judg'd of public moment, in the shape
> Of difficulty or danger could deterr
> Mee from attempting. (1.445-450)

Satan frames his choice as honoring the council, and his peers, and as his way of meriting their faith in him. There is also an emphasis here on the trappings of power, the structure. During this council, the devils still believe in Satan and his leadership, "Thus they thir doubtful consultations dark / Ended rejoycing in thir matchless Chief" (2.486-7). Once Satan makes this proclamation "The Stygian Counsel thus dissolv'd" (2.506) ending the infernal council. This is not the democratic parliament from medieval texts and only imitates the outward form of these councils. Here, Satan's tyrannical statements and decisions are not up for debate; they are only to be accepted. Satan makes himself the messenger and then leaves hell. Book 2 ends with his encounter with Sin and Death, but the council is the heart of the action, and the inciting incident for the action in Books 3 and 4, the introduction of the Son, and the true focus of the epic.

In *Paradise Lost,* heaven is described according to several structures; the power structure of God's monarchy and the hierarchy of the choirs of angels (Seraphim, Cherubim, Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, Powers, Virtues, Archangels, and Angels), and the physical structure of heaven itself. The physical space of heaven is

described through structures intrinsically connected to both movement, defense, and exclusion, "steps," "wall," "Gate." Within these descriptions there is slippage between the descriptions of the physical and power structures with one representing the other. For example, in Book 1, "Godlike shapes and forms / Excelling human, Princely Dignities, / And Powers that earst in Heaven sat on Thrones (1.358-60). Here there is a description of the shape, the structure of the fallen, provided through what they once were, their previous states, and set against the physical structures that they once occupied, both "Heaven" and "Thrones." "Powers"[119] is a reference to the hierarchal structure of the choice of angels and reinforces reading physical structures with power structures. This language is echoed again in Book 5 with the description of Lucifer after his rebellion but before the fall. Even before the creation of hell and Pandæmonium Satan is consciously attempting to recreate heavenly structures.

> They came, and Satan to his Royal seat
>
> High on a Hill, far blazing, as a Mount
>
> Rais'd on a Mount, with Pyramids and Towrs
>
> From Diamond Quarries hew'n, and Rocks of Gold,
>
> The Palace of great Lucifer, (so call
>
> That Structure in the Dialect of men
>
> Interpreted) which not long after, he
>
> Affecting all equality with God
>
> In imitation of that Mount whereon
>
> *Messiah* was declar'd in sight of Heav'n (5.756-765)

---

[119] Powers is also used in this way in 3.390.

Lucifer's status is defined by the structure he occupies, "Palace," and "Structure." There is also foreshadowing of Satan imitating heavenly structures, "In imitation" as part of his jealousy against the Son, and the fact that the Son was declared above them all, the inciting incident for Satan's actions.

Just as in Chapter Two with *Þe Deulis Perlament*, the demonic structure, the mimesis, is introduced before the heavenly one, the real one, seeming to privilege the demonic structure. Within *Paradise Lost,* titles are part of the structures indicating either political or power structures, it is a way of identifying where characters fit within the natural, or unnatural, order. This listing of the angels comes in the stanza right before God informs the angelic host that the Son is now appointed above them and that they are now required to "bow" to him (5.607) and call him "Lord" (5.608). Raphael's narrative begins with him identifying his own title, "To whom the winged Hierarch repli'd" (5.468). Once Raphael's narrative truly begins, the angels in heaven are listed by their titles, "Hierarchs" (5.587), "Ensignes" (5.588), "Standards and Gonfalons twixt Van and Reare" (5.589), and "Of Hierarchies, of Orders, and Degrees" (5.591).[120] Adam's role and title of "Patriarch of mankind" (5.506) is emphasized. Yet there is a tension[121] created in these descriptions, a paradox that angels are named, listed, and arranged per

---

[120] For more on this see Joad Raymond's 2010 *Milton's Angels: The Early Modern Imagination.* William Kolbrener's 1997 *Milton's Warring Angels: A study of Critical Engagements* also addresses this. David Quint argues in 2014's *Inside Paradise Lost* that the "class hierarchy" and inherent nobility of the unfallen angels is key to understanding power dynamics and structures (38). He also states that this rank is the reason in Book 4 that Zephron and Ithuriel cannot recognize Satan, even though he is fallen, they are still cherubum and he was an archangel. He argues this is why Gabriel does recognize him, they are of the same rank (39).

[121] Neil Forsyth argues in his 1996 article "Rebellion in *Paradise Lost:* Impossible Original" that one source of this tension is the epic's purpose as both an origin story and non-origin story (151).

martial structure when they are beings who should never know war. This emphasizes just how much Satan's influence has contaminated the angelic host. The paradox is that the angels are named for their future purpose and peaceful angels inherently know war. Joseph Wittreich argues that this tension, the contradictions are part of the revision process from 1667 to 1674 (55), a stance that Bryson agrees with, using changes in theology from *De Doctrina Christiana* (1655) to *Paradise Lost* as evidence (Bryson, "Mysterious" 197). Many of *Paradise Lost's* contradictory ideas are tied to presentations of divinity, God, and the Son (Bryson, "Mysterious" 198). This may be because God is unknowable, the fact that humanity can never truly understand the divine. It may be because Milton is striving to reconcile several different narratives. Satan's actions, on the other hand, the actions of the fallen, are indubitably understandable, and it is this accessibility that makes them such excellent lessons of how not to act. Like Malmesbury, Milton often brings up problematic or contradictory issues only to dismiss them without addressing them.

The two infernal councils in *Paradise Lost* occurring in Book 2 and Book 10 bookend and frame the actions of the fallen, but this is not their only purpose. Their true purpose is to reassert the authority of God and the Son. As carnival antics serve to reaffirm the natural law and the demonic parliaments in Chapter Two reveal that there is no authority other than God's, so too do the infernal councils in *Paradise Lost* establish God and the Son's power as absolute. *Paradise Lost* sets this up early in the epic with the heavenly council occurring in Book 3, directly after the infernal council in Book 2

(Slaska-Sapala, "Dialogue" 211),[122] which forces the reader to read them together, comparing the characters and action. Satan names himself "Prince," the fallen that accompany him are called "His ministers of vengeance" (1.170) mimicking the titles and hierarchies seen in heaven. This title also lends itself to the scholarship which argues that Satan is meant to be read as a critique of tyrants such as Cromwell, and the monarchy as a whole. As we saw in Chapter Two, Satan's infernal council replicates the exact same structures it rebelled against. The reader has both the narrator and Satan's descriptions of heaven to base their comparison on, and while there's an emphasis on structures there's no negative connotation to the structures itself. Rather there's a presentation of real, and simulacrum. The fallen (re)create heavenly power structures and invoke the heavenly power structures through word choice; "Hierarchie," "Orders" (1.737), "Heav'n high Towrs" (1.749), "solemn Councel" (1.755), and "Pandæmonium, the high Capital" (1.756). The buildings and the words echo the real while highlighting that in Pandæmonium everything is a simulacrum. The new hierarchy is created through "deeds, materialistic achievements, and actions, instead of a sense of natural worth and divinely ordained order" (Berthold 158) a revision of the "werkes" seen in Chapter Two, and because of this they must fail. Satan and the fallen cannot (re)create heaven, or the earned merit that makes the Son a good leader and role model; in hell, "merit may be gained only through over works" (Berthold 158), like the building of Pandæmonium.

Reading the structures of hell as both a mimicry and a critique of heaven's structures helps reconcile some of the epic poem's statements about monarchy and

---

[122] Slaska-Sapala's work mainly focuses on the heavenly council as a revision of Olympic, classical ones.

tyranny. “There is nothing inherently right or wrong with the monarchial form of government on earth is evident, first, from the fact that there is nothing inherently right or wrong with it in heaven” (Walker 282). Rather it is the perversion and abuse of this power that is constructed as demonic. Satan’s role as tyrant, the building of Pandæmonium, and the formation of demonic councils are parallels to the physical and power structures seen in heaven. Satan’s actions against God are framed as against “God’s ordering *power*” (Bennett 448) and a “betrayal of the *laws* of creation” (Bennet 449) [emphasis mine]. Satan’s actions are framed as acting as Adversary against God and heaven’s power structures, particularly legal ones. Bennett argues that Satan as tyrant seeks to “replace government by rational law with government by arbitrary power” (451). This is also a form of simulacrum, imitation that cannot replicate the original, and ultimately, only reinforces the original power structures.

Reading heavenly and demonic structures in parallel allows us to see what differentiates the two. Just as Malmesbury’s *Gesta regum Anglorum* contrasts and defines good leaders and role models against devilish leaders, so too does *Paradise Lost* define what is demonic against the heavenly and angelic. “The device of contrast, imitating the destruction of unity, is frequently encountered: Hell contrasts with Heaven and both with Eden; Satan with the Son” (Shawcross 42). In Book 3 as Satan wanders amongst worlds it is the physical nature and structure of them that is emphasized:

> All this dark Globe the Fiend found as he pass’d,
> And long he wanderd, till at last a gleame
> Of dawning light turnd thither-ward in haste
> His travell’d steps; farr distant he descries

Ascending by degrees magnificent

Up to the wall of Heaven a Structure high,

At top whereof, but farr more rich appeer'd

The work as of a Kingly Palace Gate

With Frontispice of Diamond and Gold

Imbellisht, thick with sparkling orient Gemmes

The Portal shon, inimitable on Earth

By Model, or by shading Pencil drawn.

The Stairs were such as whereon Jacob saw

Angels ascending and descending, bands

Of Guardians bright, when he from Esau fled

To Padan-Aram in the field of Luz,

Dreaming by night under the open Skie,

And waking cri'd, This is the Gate of Heav'n (3.498-515)

Here structure emphasizes movement, journeys, entering places where revelations can occur as seen in the words "steps," "Gate," "Portal," and "stairs." These structures also mark certain spaces as boundaries, "Gate," "Portal," and "wall" framing Satan's movements within these spaces as a transgression. Satan transgresses against the natural order when he mimics these structures in hell and when he moves amongst these original structures. When Satan encounters heaven on his own, it is the physical "Structure" that is emphasized, "the wall,"[123] the "Kingly Palace Gate," the "Frontispiece of Diamond and Gold," "The Portal," "The Stairs," the "Gate of Heav'n." The "Gate of Heaven" as

---

[123] The "wall of Heaven" is mentioned again in the Argument for Book 6.

representative structure of heaven is also seen in the Book 3 Argument, as well as "Heaven Gate" (5.198, 7.618, 10.22, 10.88). It is not the grace, or art of heaven that is described but the practical, physical trappings and structures. The emphasis on the concept of movement connects these structures to the ideas of power and access. The reader knows that hell is below and heaven is above but in Book 3 Satan has no trouble moving amongst these worlds, reinforcing the liminal role of the devil, his identity as a figure who crosses physical and moral borders. It also highlights how far he has fallen. He "wanderd" because he has been displaced. He walks on a "lower stair" (3.540) because what he seeks is below heaven, as he "Looks down with wonder" (3.542) not only because Earth is below and his focus but also because he can no longer ascend and descend at will the ways the Angels can.

In Book 1 and 2 the infernal councils are pale imitations of English Parliaments, mimicking the reality to ridicule it. However, they are also "patterned after the celestial government" (Rudwin, "Pandemonium" 463). Book 1's "thir summons called" (1.757) mimics the King's speech and the course of procedure in Parliament. A core tenet of the English Parliament is debate, which Satan only pays lip service to. In Book 2 the eight references to "state" (2.1, 24, 251, 279, 302, 387, 511, 585) also invoke the three estates of Parliament, the Lords Spiritual, Lords Temporal, and Commons. The words that appear before "state"—"Throne of Royal" (2.1), "happier" (2.24), "our" (2.251), "settl'd" (2.279), "Pillar of" (2.302), "infernal" (2.387), "God-like imitated" (2.511), and "former" (2.585)—also provide a lens through which to view this emphasis on state. The use of state for estate itself highlights the political, geographic, and national connotations. "Throne" and "Pillar" emphasize the physical structure and the emphasis on the trappings

of systems. The fallen's state in hell is "infernal" in part because it is a pale imitation of God's state in heaven. It cannot be real or true as we saw in Chapter Two, it can only be mimesis. "Former" also reveals that the devils and what they attempt will always be measured against what they once were. This use of state in conjunction with the structure of the infernal council reinforces the devil's political nature.

Within *Paradise Lost* the infernal council in Book 2 highlights Satan's betrayal of his people while reinforcing the construction of speech and structures as demonic. This demonic portrayal of Parliament focuses on Satan's pride and self-centeredness as the primary danger with the collective, democratic government the infernal council representing a secondary danger. The infernal council in *Paradise Lost* highlights the danger when an ambitious, manipulative figure takes control of the power structures, like Cromwell did with the Rump Parliament of 1649-1653, and then when he dissolved Parliament altogether. Even if this collective is made up of fallen angels who become gods,[124] it is still demonic and a threat because "Democratic freedom of speech and discussion prevails at the infernal council" (Rudwin, "Pandemonium" 469). *Paradise Lost's* revision of infernal councils highlights the duplicity of hell and Satan. The fallen believe they are participating in a republican system of government that values their voices but these councils simply reiterate the fraud Satan is perpetuating. This infernal council is an excellent example of carnival—it mocks political structures and authority

---

[124] In her 1959 thesis, *Synod of Gods: The Infernal Council in Book Two of Milton's Paradise Lost,* Wynema Burns Caswell argues that the "infernal council adds no progress to the actions in *Paradise Lost*," but this simply is not true (158). She goes on to state that "Although the council may not move the poem, it certainly enriches it" (160). In addition to revealing the "facets of Satan's evil" (158) these councils are the lens through which to understand the focus of the epic, the nationalistic arguments, and the devil's role in shaping these.

only to reinforce ultimately the things they mock. Satan and all the fallen are Lords of Misrule, the inversion of their former, unfallen, selves and the natural order. The irony here, as it was in Chapter Two, is that the fallen are unaware that their purpose is not to defeat the authority and gain control but to reassert the natural order. They are a "temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order" (Bakhtin 10) that "affirms the people's immortal, indestructible character" (Bakhtin 256). The rituals and actions of the fool who complete them serve only to legitimize the authority of the Lord. In *Paradise Lost,* the Lord whose authority is ultimately reasserted is Satan's in Book 2 and God's in Book 10 reinforcing that the council in Book 10 is the inverse of Book 2. The purpose of the infernal council in Book 2 is to showcase the elements that make up the inversion and perversion of heavenly councils while the council in Book 10 reasserts the natural, divine order. The overlapping purpose of both councils is to emphasize that the fallen only truly become the fallen in the council scenes (Caswell 24) where they display through speech the fact that they have learned nothing from their fall, perform their demonic nature, and ensure they will continue to be damned. They continue to act in ways that counter God, the Son, and divine, natural order. This emphasis on action is established by the amount of action verbs in the council (Caswell 30), how their actions began in rebellion, continued in war, and ended in hell.

Influential speech in the hands of devilish leaders can have far-reaching consequences on the national and universal stage. The speeches in the infernal councils are persuasive, as seen specifically in Belial's speech in Pandæmonium in Book 2 (119-225) when he attempts to persuade the fallen that their fate is not that bad. Belial speaks "with persuasive accent" in line 118 and in line 226 "with words clothed in reason's

garb" (Agari 550-1). Satan's words have clear consequences resulting in military action; "He spake: and to confirm his words, out-flew / Millions of flaming swords, drawn from the thighs / Of mighty Cherubim" (1.663-5). The democratic collective is dangerous in large part because of the potential dangers in speech. Speech can manipulate feelings, foment rebellion, and lead to war. It threatens natural law and order.

Book 10 is the infernal council that bookends the war and Satan's actions on Earth. Book 10 operates in reverse, Satan opens with his proclamation that his mission was successful, that the fallen's "new Kingdom" (10.406) will now proceed in honor. The object of simulacra, the mimicked political structures are again the focus as, "*Pandæmonium,* Citie and proud seate / Of *Lucifer*" (10.424-5) are mentioned. But as these are demonic constructs, the success is short lived. The "Council" (10.428) seats itself to listen to Satan's recap of his adventures, the inverse of "the ruler of hell meditates on his enemies' successes" (Cool 17), "Thir mighty Chief returnd" (10.455). He then "calls to council his subject-demons," "I call ye and declare ye now, returnd / Successful beyond hope, to lead ye forth / Triumphant out of this infernal Pit" (10.462-4). Instead of a formal speech explaining the problem, Satan brags about his success, describing his adventures in detail to this second infernal council (10.469-503). But rather than "one or more fiends reply to his speech," instead they are all transformed, with their response or replies cut off. Their narrative is not only stopped, it is taken over, hijacked:

> So having said, a while he stood, expecting
> Thir universal shout and high applause
> To fill his eare, when contrary he hears
> On all sides, from innumerable tongues

> A dismal universal hiss, the sound
>
> Of public scorn; he wondered, but not long
>
> Had leasure, wondring at himself now more;
>
> His Visage drawn he felt to sharp and spare,
>
> His Arms clung to his Ribs, his Leggs entwining
>
> Each other, till supplanted down he fell
>
> A monstrous Serpent on his Belly prone,
>
> Reluctant, but in vaine, a greater power
>
> Now rul'd him, punisht in the shape he sin'd. (10.504-516)

The transformation of the fallen is also a change in perspective and power within the epic. Satan goes from being "Thir glorious Chief" to the ambiguous pronoun "they," (10. 538, 541, 545, 558) "thir," (541, 545, 547, 550) and "them" (539) used to refer to all the fallen. This emphasizes the collective nature of the fallen and demoting Satan as just one of the many. The divine punishment and transformation strips him of the titles he gave himself and his illusion of power. This pronoun usage also moves the perspective of the narrative into ambiguous territory. With the use of "they," the reader no longer knows if this is Satan's narrative or another outside perspective. As the lines move forward and the rest of the fallen's punishment is described, "thir" and "they" continue to be used furthering the ambiguity. After Sin and Death's roles in this new reality are revealed, the reader realizes that the perspective has subtly shifted; "which th' Almightie seeing, / From his transcendent Seat the Saints among, / To those bright Orders utterd thus his voice" (10.613-5). These lines remind the reader that the Almighty has been the witness

to all of this and that the voice and power of the poem has shifted to God, signaling that the natural order has been restored.

Satan's plan to action is replaced by divine punishment, their serpent shape, the "annual humblings" (10.576), the "Famin" (10.573). Rather than the devil dispatching a messenger to carry out the agreed-on plan, Sin and Death become the demonic messengers to mankind and the Earth (570-609) but not under Satan's command or control. Instead they are part of the divine plan and order. Here destruction, the "unimmortal make" (10.611) is the inverse of the simulacrum of creation seen in the first instance of the infernal creation. This is also tied to instances of carnival, mimicking power structures, and "misrule" (10.628). The fallen's punishment (10.504-547) is followed by the description of the effects on Earth now that Sin, and Death are loose on the world (10.585-640). In this way, Sin and Death represent more consequences of how Satan's actions have set evil loose on the world. If these lines restore order through transformation, the presence of Sin and Death expand the known concept of what creation includes.

As final proof that the infernal council in Book 10 is the inverse not only of the genre but of its own presentation in Book 2, the text reveals that the devil/Satan is not the one orchestrating this council, in fact the infernal council is not the audience as it was in Book 2; "He ended, and the Heav'nly Audience loud/Sung *Halleluia*" (10.641-2) where "He" is the Creator, God. There is slippage here between God and the narrator as we saw in Chapter Two, words can be both creation and narratives. In Chapter Two the only creation the devils are capable of is telling their own narrative. As we saw with ambiguous language, the words themselves are not inherently evil, it is totally dependent

on who is using them. Book 10's narrative reveals that only God can create, reordering the universe, restoring law and order, and correcting the errors that are the effect of Satan's actions through speech.

Diabolical Rebels

Rebellion is a defining characteristic of England in the seventeenth century. From the Bishop's War in Scotland (1639) to the Irish Rebellion (1641) and the English Civil War (1642-9), the shadow of rebellion preoccupied England. *Paradise Lost's* portrayal of rebellion reflects anxieties over the internal threats that existed during this time. The Irish Rebellion breaks out in October 1641, foreshadowing many of the issues that come to the forefront during the English Civil War. Milton would have been intimately aware of the experience and effects of rebellion, at home in England, and in Ireland (Canino 15). Popular political tracts and documents from 1641 and 1642 describe the Irish "as savage, demonic, and as enemies of God" and "Milton's representation of the rebels may in fact have drawn on the anti-Irish polemic of the 1640s" (Canino 21). Likewise, in anti-Irish rhetoric used in tracts against Charles I and in Milton's own work *Observations Upon the Articles of Peace* (1649), the Irish rebels are "inhumane," "bloudy," "merciless" and "barbarous" who are "followers of the Antichrist" (Canino 17). Milton's *History of Britain* also provides a negative view of the Irish (Canino 18). While not being named within the text, the historical rebellions play, playing in the background of the text of *Paradise Lost.*

The rebelling devils in the epic then are stand-ins for concerns about rebellion as an internal threat to the English nation-state. Historically, these threats were political in nature, threatening the norm, just as Satan's play for power threatens God. The rebellion

of the angels echoes the recent rebellions of the English Civil War. In the fallen we can read both the Republicans and the Royalists representing repressed, political threats to the political state of Heaven, that have been put down, defeated, but still represent the possibility of danger. Both the fallen, and the angels who initially sided with them, are internal threats. They were all once part of the court and hierarchy of Heaven, as the Republicans and Royalists were all once part of England. Where people's loyalties lie, and whether or not people are truly who they say they are, are all internal threats.

In *Paradise Lost*, Satan is connected to and defined through war and rebellion as seen in the opening of Book 1; "Who first seduc'd them to that foul revolt?" (1.33). His seduction, his temptation, is innately tied to his speech, and the equivocation he uses which is directly tied to revolt. It is not just Satan that is defined by his rebellion but all the fallen, with most of the collective only identified and named as Satan's "Godless crew" and "Rebellious" followers (6.49-50). From the beginning of the epic in Book I Satan's "revolt" (1.33), and his "Rebel Angels" (1.38), are connected to the fact that he "Rais'd impious War in Heav'n and Battel proud / With vain attempt" (1.43-44) connecting rebellion and war. Angels that rebel and war are a perversion of the natural order. Book 6 emphasizing the titles and terms of war from the opening forward, "thick embatteld Squadrons bright / Chariots and flaming Armes, and fierie Steeds" (6.16-17). Here there is an emphasis on the tools of war, "Squadrons," "Chariots," "Armes," and "Steeds." Satan uses the tools at his disposal, even inventing new ones to further his cause. In the Book 6 Argument, Satan's devilish actions involving speech and war are collapsed, "He calls a Councel, invents devilish Engines." Satan's leadership, speech, and rebellious actions overlap and intertwine.

As seen in Chapter Three when personal rebellion becomes a national one, the consequences for the nation are greater. In Book 1, "war" is mentioned twenty-five times, the variation "warr" ten times, and "battel" eight times despite Book 1's not focusing on rebellion or war in the ways Book 5 and 6 do. Satan's devilish leadership is inherently martial, another indicator that he is not dedicated to peace and therefore not a good king. Satan is defined for the war that leads to rebellion and the fall of the angels and eventually the fall of Adam and Eve. One indicator of Satan's rebellion is his inversion and perversion of the heavenly titles he does not earn but bestows upon himself, "O Prince, O Chief" (1.128), "General" (1.337), "their general" (1.337), "Their great commander" (1.358), and "Their dread commander" (1.589). The fallen likewise are defined by their martial state, they are "Warriors" (1.316). The function of the fallen becomes the main signifier of who and what they are. Satan's martial and monarchical titles as well as the later listing of former gods in the infernal council of Book 2 establish the ways the fallen are the inverse of their brethren, the "Empyreal Host" described in Book 5 (583). These descriptions that focus on forms and titles are one of the ways that the demonic is tied to imitated structures.

Satan's devilish leadership and his use of demonic speech to manipulate both contribute to his rebellion, which "is of cardinal importance to *Paradise Lost.* Without Satan's rebellion, man would possibly not have been created and would certainly not have fallen" (Williams 253). Like its revision of the English devil figure, *Paradise Lost's* presentation of rebellion both invokes and counters popular understandings of the origins

of Satan's rebellion. In the Old English text *Genesis B* (c. 1000),[125] Satan presumes he is greater than God and for this presumption is cast out from heaven. The "*Cursor Mundi* and the craft plays continue the same tradition" (Williams 257), identifying Satan's pride as the reason for his fall. Milton builds on this motivation but also expands it. Within *Paradise Lost* it is not just Satan's pride that inspires his rebellion; it is his jealousy of the Son set above him which "sets off Satan's rebellion" (Williams 262). The complete motivation of Satan, as Milton explains it, is compounded of several elements: Biblical pride, the envy seen in medieval texts,[126] and folkloric references (Williams 262-3).

Satan rebels[127] because he cannot stand the idea that God would create the Son and then place him above the angels whom he loved first, and before then, best:

---

[125] Multiple scholars have drawn parallels between the characterization of Satan in Old English texts and *Paradise Lost.* J. W. Lever's 1947 "Paradise Lost and the Anglo-Saxon Tradition" argues that Milton was attempting to create a work that followed "a national poetic tradition" (97) and when he became displeased with the comparisons between Charles I and King Arthur, he sought other, older sources, namely Caedmon's work. Lever begins his argument by stating that there is a controversy with regards to what sources Milton used, then goes on to discuss Milton's research of Arthurian myths, with Spenser as a source. When Milton became disillusioned with Charles I, he "abandoned the legendary and royalist Arthur for the historical and constitutional Alfred" (98). Lever says that as Milton lost "faith in England", he abandoned "his lifelong intention of writing a national epic" (99). This changed when Milton became acquainted with Junius and studied his Caedmon manuscript that bears quite a few similarities to Paradise Lost in structure, lines, and characterization. Lever ends by stating that while there are many similarities, the Caedmon source should be seen only as an inspiration, not a model.
[126] While envy as a motivation has its roots in medieval texts it also "enjoyed some popularity among literary men of the seventeenth century" (Williams 266), seen in works such as Andreini's *L'Adamo* (1613), Odoricus Valmorana's *Demonomachiae, sive De Bello Intellegentiarum super Divini Verbi Incarnatione* (1623), and Thomas Heywood's *The Hierarchie of the Blessed Angels* (1623), and Joost van Vondel's *Lucifer* (1654).
[127] For more on different variations of the origins of Satan's rebellions and Satan's rebellion in a larger context see Neil Forsyth's 1996 "Rebellion in *Paradise Lost:* Impossible Original" and Stella Purce Revard's 1980 *The War in Heaven: Paradise Lost and the Tradition of Satan's Rebellion*. Revard's work while detailed as a collection of essays covering twenty years, was not well received by scholars. It is criticized for trying to do too much and not working well with texts in the original language (Campbell 141).

> This day I have begot whom I declare
> My only Son, and on this holy Hill
> Him have anointed, whom ye now behold
> At my right hand; your Head I him appoint; (5.603-6)

The angels are told to "bow" (5.607) to the Son, to "abide" (5.609) by his rules, to obey or else be "Cast out from God and blessed vision" (5.613). Satan is not the only one bothered by this turn of events, "All seemd well pleas'd, all seem'd but were not all" (5.617). The soon-to-be-fallen are described collectively as we saw with the infernal councils. Yet the reader does not hear the motivations or narratives of the other devils. Satan's narrative is all we get. He was "the first" (5.659) "In favor and præeminence" (5.661) and suffers great "envie against the Son of God" (5.662). His "pride" (5.665), his belief that he should not be subservient to anyone, is his motivation for rebelling.

Satan's rebellion, like Hotspur's and Macbeth's, at first seems to be personally motivated, a reaction to personal slights and betrayals. Yet Satan's rebellion like these others, is ultimately against larger political structures as represented by a monarch. So, Hotspur feels personally betrayed by King Henry which he in turns believes makes King Henry unfit to be king. Macbeth believes he deserves to be king which he then uses to excuse his assassination of Duncan. Satan feels both personally betrayed and more deserving that the Son, and he uses these feelings to justify his rebellion. Like Hotspur and Macbeth, his rebellion is not just against the Son but the divine monarchy and the political structures and state he represents. "State" is used in several ways within the epic, to reflect morality as in state of grace, to show status, and to signify the political structure. The word is used to describe an exemplar, to live without sin is to live in a

"happier state."[128] This is like the "quiet state of men" (12.80) of the end of the epic, it is the model for humankind to follow to reach this "state." Yet the word is also used to describe Satan in specifically political terms. As we have seen, the devil is an innately political figure. State is used in two main ways in conjunction with Satan within the epic, first, it is used to describe his internal "state" and second it is used to described his position within a political structure. Using "state" to describe Satan illustrates his innately political nature and function.

Within the epic "state" is used to describe Satan's former state and his sinful state. The former state represents when he obeyed divine order and conformed, his sinful state represents his rebellion. His conflicted infernal state is mentioned as well. Satan's state, his titles, his position, are all political in nature, either defined by his position in political structures or by his opposition to those political structures. Satan is defined by his place within a political structure. State is also used to reference specific political structures and trappings of power that Satan covets, conquers, or desires; "High on a Throne of Royal State" (2.1), "God-like imitated State" (2.511), "For state, as Sovran King, and to enure / Our prompt obedience" (8.239-40), "state of the Church" (Book 12 Argument), and "With fair egualitie, fraternal state" (12.26). These phrases have parallel meanings, both actual structures that represent the political, as with throne, or larger political symbolism as in "God-like imitated State." Satan desires the trappings of political power, the throne, because he believes taking on these outward markers will make him over into the "Sovran King." Yet he is not happy with just the mimicry of the material markers of power and authority, he wants the real power.

---

[128] This phrase is mentioned twelve times within the epic.

This overlap of "state" as representative of both political power and political structure is seen in how Satan, overlaps and employs both. As we saw in Chapter Two, devils pervert political structures for their own purposes. The fallen twist the structures and terms of heaven, hierarchy, and political structures, remaking, or perhaps unmaking them. In Book 1 Satan uses "Regal State" (1.640) to describe God, and when the fallen gather at the end of Book 1 they "confer / Thir State affairs" (1.774-5). These uses signify the political positioning in both cases. Satan's envy of the Son's status, his political position, Satan's envy "of his State" (6.89) is the motivation for his rebellion.

While the first use of "state" refers to Satan's place within the political structure, both before and after the fall, the second specifically refers to the state as the place that Satan covets, the Son's state of grace, his state of distinctions granted by God's honor, and finally, the political state represented through sovereignty. As we saw in Chapter Three with Hotspur and Macbeth, Satan does not believe that the Son has earned his role, and therefore decides he does not have to serve his king or honor him. To choose not to serve your thane/lord is paralleled with refusing to serve your God/Lord:

> This is servitude,
> To serve th' unwise, or him who hath rebelld
> Against his worthier, as thine now serve thee,
> Thy self not free, but to thy self enthrall'd;
> Yet leudly dar'st our ministring upbraid. (6.178-182)

In Book 4 Satan ponders if "there is no place / Left for repentance, none for pardon left? / None left but by submission" (4.79-81) and ultimately decides that submission and servitude are a price he is unwilling to pay. While it is a tangent to the focus of Satan's

rebellion, good angels are defined by their obedience, their subservience, "Whom to obey is happiness entire" (6.741). Satan's refusal to submit is the motivation for him causing "mischief" (9.472) to get his "revenge" (9.466). Just as we saw in Chapter Three, what begins as a personal war, motivated by Satan's personal envy, does not stay personal, quickly escalating to have larger political ramifications. Just as Hotspur and Macbeth's personal jealousies end up having larger, national implications so, too, does Satan's personal envies end up having larger, universal implications for heaven and the angelic host.

One aspect that makes Satan's actions such a threat to the state is that he is not content to rebel alone. Defiance by refusing to act subservient is not enough, he must also act on his beliefs and his wants, to gather others to his cause. As part of his desire for power he actively seeks the adoration and subservience of others. He is no longer content with freedom from servitude he wants power of his own now that he has seen what true power and privilege are in the form of the Son. These traits contribute to Satan's characterization as a devilish leader: his falseness, his fraud, and the fact that he seduces other angels away from God and the Son to serve his own interests, "infus'd / Bad influence into th' unwarie brest / Of his Associate" (5. 694-6). Once he calls others to his cause he becomes a "superior voice" (5.705), "thir great Potentate" (5.706). At the point that Satan's rebellion spreads to the other angels infecting them, Satan is first named with a title. From then on chronologically in the narrative he collects titles, acquiring the outer trappings of power without having any actual power. Yet as we saw in Chapter Two he is unaware that what he has is only mimicry, he is incapable of acquiring true power.

Satan's rebellion in *Paradise Lost* is dangerous because it counters God's natural authority and because he inspires other angels to betray the Almighty. As we saw in Chapters One and Three, his actions are not self-contained, they spread, infecting others with his contamination. Satan's rebellion becomes a "contagion" which spread (5.880) through heaven. The rebelling angels then challenge the natural order of heaven and the rigorous social hierarchies. Rebels are threats because they counter the natural law and authority and can destroy the nation, corrupting it from within. In the century before *Paradise Lost's* writing the greatest threat to England, its monarchy and people, came from rebellion, from the numerous internal challenges Elizabeth I faced in the final years of her reign, to the Gunpowder Plot under James, to the English Civil War.

The "instability" of Satan's rebellion reflects anxieties about the concept of rebellion, a concept later revisited in both *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*, at the same time as it gestures to the need to beware of the "slippery uses of political rhetoric" (Loewenstein 206). Anxiety about rebellion was acute in these unsettled decades; godliness, particularly if it smacked of sectarianism, was often seen as "a Cloak for Rebellion, and Religion a pretence for Treason."[129] Milton's contemporaries, after all, were constantly reminded of the importance of obedience, and social hierarchy since they had been sanctioned by nature and God, custom, and tradition (Loewenstein 7). As Loewenstein argues, "Rebels were indeed represented—by writers of both royalist and parliamentarian persuasion—as monstrous and demonic: barbarous and bloody cannibals, a bastard brood, strange children and accursed devils in the shape of men, hellhounds and

---

[129] Loewenstein's explanatory note: "See e.g. *Rebels no Saints,* p.154; see also Thomas Marriot, *Rebellion Unmasked* (London, 1661), 23.

Hydra-like monsters" (176). The devil was a rebel, and rebels are demonic, a circular construction of dangers and threats.

The Son as Divine and Meritorious Role Model

Rebellion, while inherently demonic is also the mechanism for restoring order. While rebellion is an affront to natural law and order, rebellion also allows the role models, the heroes, to restore order. The good kings in Chapter One with *Gesta regum Anglorum,* Hal and Macduff from*1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth,* were all presented as role models and the mechanism to restore order. The Son fulfills the same role in *Paradise Lost.* These characters are two sides of the same coin; they are even conceived at the same time, "the very moment the Son is said to be begotten to make everyone happy forever, God's word also calls Satan into being, not as Lucifer, his earlier name, but as a rebel, the disobedient" (Forsyth, *Satanic* 175). The Son stands in as the contrast to Satan's devilish, military, leadership while the Almighty stands in as the contrast for Satan's mimesis of creation with his infernal council and Pandæmonium. One of the keys to reading Satan and the Son as inverse images is analyzing how merit is applied to both within the epic.

Initially, Satan's merits for becoming king of hell are that he was the first in heaven. Yet hell is the inverse of heaven so the logic of this does not quite follow. As with much of Satan's character what is first presented is not accurate or the truth. Satan's true merit is defined by deeds, by accomplishments. He has led the fallen in war, he brings them together in the infernal councils, and he gives them a plan for surviving and succeeding Satan's merit is the inverse, the mirror image of the Son, he is, at least on the surface, raised up to power through his merits (Berthold 153). Within the epic, the Son's

merits are presented as indisputable because God raises him up. Later when the Son proves himself it only reinforces the rightness of God's choice. The paradox is the Son does not need to prove his worth, as his divine nature makes him worthy. Yet, as a contrast to Satan, the Son's actions prove, albeit unnecessarily, that he is worthy of the honors God has bestowed on him. It is merit more than any other trait that defines the Son and Satan through contrast. With the Son, his main merit is that he is the son of God and therefore any other merit he demonstrates is extra, not necessary. Arguably birthright is not a merit, and certainly Satan does not think so as it is one of his first complaints about the Son, that he has not done anything to earn his place in heaven, certainly not a place that puts him above others who were there first and have proven their merit (Berthold 157).

Even Satan is aware of the dual meanings of merit, as seen in Book 2 where Satan contrasts what he had in heaven, his role that "Hath been achieved of merit" (2.21) with what they have after the fall. In heaven, titles, and honor were based on merit but reading hell as the inverse of heaven, the higher your rank, the unhappier you are. If the fallen believe they will be happier the lower their position, then they are unlikely to challenge Satan's authority We can also read this as a one of Satan's first deceptions to solidify his power base. This dissemblance is one of control; Satan provides a familiar political and power structure for the fallen to follow but changes the dynamic so they believe they will be free when really, they will only serve Satan's agenda. As with most of his rhetoric it initially appears to be democratic in nature but is ultimately revealed to only serve Satan's own interests.

Within the epic, "merit" is used as "a standard of justification in Heaven and Hell, as both the Son and Satan are said to be exalted by their merits" (Berthold 153). The Son and Satan are inseparable as one defines the other by contrast, what one has the other lacks and can only seek to imitate (Berthold 162). The Son's merit is divine, Satan's is earned, but because it is earned outside of heaven it is not real. The Son is shown as meriting his status because God says so, and then through his actions as general during the war in heaven.[130] The paradox of the Son is that his nature, which ensures he does not need to prove his merit, being inherently good, blessed, and virtuous, is the exact thing that compels his to act meritoriously. "When the Son heroically drives the rebellious angels out of Heaven, he shows himself eminently worth of his exaltation. He has, as it were, seconded his natural merit with a display of his considerable abilities" (Berthold 160). The Son not only acts rightly because it is his nature, but because it is also what the angels need. The angels follow him because of his merit and because his cause is righteous,

> to subdue
>
> By force, who reason for thir Law refuse,

---

[130] Kalina Slaska-Sapala argues in "*Paradise Lost* and the Language of Epic Rebellion" that "Milton has replaced monarchy with meritocracy in heaven, while confusing and conflating centuries of debates about the nature of the Trinity" (6). For more scholarship on Milton's presentation of the monarchy see Ruth Mohl's 1949 *Studies in Spenser, Milton and the Theory of Monarchy,* Richard Hardin's 1992 *Civil Idolatry: Desacralizing and Monarchy in Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton,* Laura Lunger Knoppers's 1994 *Historicizing Milton: Spectacle, Power, and Poetry in Restoration England*, Joan Bennett's 1977 "God, Satan, and King Charles: Milton's Royal Portraits," and Michael Bryson's "'His Tyranny Who Reigns': The Biblical Roots of Divine Kingship and Milton's Rejection of 'Heav'n's King.'"

> Right reason for thir Law, and for thir King
>
> Messiah, who by right of merit Reigns. (6.40-43)

During the war in heaven Satan is described as “severe” (6.825), “full of wrauth” (6.827), and “fierce” (6.829). When facing him in this manner, “all resistance lost, / All courage; down thir idle weapons drop’d” (6.838-9). The Son’s power overcomes all and no one is safe “from his ire” (6.843). Yet even with subduing all these numbers, “half his strength he put not forth” (6.853) which shows his might and his mercy, as even in his terrible wrath he shows mercy, “for he meant / Not to destroy, but root them out of Heav’n” (6.854-5). The Son’s transformation “into terrour chang’d / His count’nance too severe to be beheld” (6.824-5) is not a Satanic deception, but is a symbol of his power, his justified, righteous, anger.

The Son’s divine status grants him merits because he is part of a divine monarchy but he also earns it through his actions during the war in heaven. He is innately a good leader and his actions reinforce this. Satan’s merit for his position on the other hand is inherently demonic as it is not mentioned until after the fall. Merit “occurs twenty-one times in the poem in one form or another” (Berthold 154). Tension is created by the dual nature of merit in the epic, both natural and earned (Berthold 160). The Son’s merit is a point of tension in the epic, as the reader is expected to accept his role without question, yet the reader should also question his merit because the angels do: “The initial exaltation of the Son is the first test we see of the angels’ sense of divine order and natural merit” (Berthold 160). The fallen do not trust the initial bestowing of merit and the second, the merit earned by the Son through his role as general in the war is unnecessary because the angels who are still true believers do not need proof. While Satan must deceive angels to

draw them to his side in Book 5 there is no equivalent between God, the Son, and the loyal angels. Instead, at the beginning of Book 6 the Son uses his speech to commend them:

> Servant of God, well done, well hast thou fought
>
> The better fight, who single hast maintaind
>
> Against revolted multitudes the Cause
>
> Of Truth, in word mightier then they in Armes;
>
> And for the testimonie of Truth hast born
>
> Universal reproach, far worse to beare
>
> Then violence: for this was all thy care
>
> To stand approv'd in sight of God, though Worlds
>
> Judg'd thee perverse: the easier conquest now
>
> Remains thee, aided by this host of friends,
>
> Back on thy foes more glorious to return
>
> Then scornd thou didst depart, and to subdue
>
> By force, who reason for thir Law refuse,
>
> Right reason for thir Law, and for thir King
>
> Messiah, who by right of merit Reigns.
>
> Go Michael of Celestial Armies Prince,
>
> And thou in Military prowess next
>
> Gabriel, lead forth to Battel these my Sons
>
> Invincible, lead forth my armed Saints
>
> By Thousands and by Millions rang'd for fight;

Equal in number to that Godless crew

Rebellious, them with Fire and hostile Arms

Fearless assault, and to the brow of Heav'n

Pursuing drive them out from God and bliss,

Into thir place of punishment, the Gulf

Of Tartarus, which ready opens wide

His fiery Chaos to receave thir fall. (6.29-55)

He emphasizes their service, emphasizes the righteousness of their good cause, and their eventual "glorious" victory. He also echoes the "law" that Satan uses to deceive and seduce and Abdiel uses to reject Satan in Book 5. The Son also praises the loyal angels' individual traits. The Son's speech is true, inspiring, and complimentary, the opposite of Satan's deceptive speech.

The Son is the only divinely blessed role model of leadership in *Paradise Lost*, but Gabriel and Abdiel serve as proto-role models within the epic because they are faithful, obedient servants. Gabriel is an imperfect role model because he is flawed, he does not first recognize Satan. Only the Son and God can be the perfect role models. Like Gabriel, Abdiel is also an imperfect role model because he does not at first recognize the danger Satan poses. Yet as we have seen, Abdiel can see past Satan's equivocation, ultimately using Satan's own words against him.[131] Just as devilish leaders like Satan use

[131] For more on Abdiel's crucial role in the epic see Allan H. Gilbert's 1942 "The Theological Basis of Satan's Rebellion and the Function of Abdiel in Paradise Lost," Gerald Richman's 2003 "A Third Choice: Adam, Eve, and Abdiel," Jack Goldman's 1970 "Insight into Milton's Abdiel," C.W. Durham's 2006 "'Suffering for Truth's Sake': The Conflict between Abdiel and Satan in Paradise Lost." and his 1992 "'To Stand Approv'd in Sight of God": Abdiel, Obedience, and Hierarchy in *Paradise Lost*."

demonic speech to lead the angels astray, good role models can see through the deception, the fraud, the equivocation for what it is, and countering it with truth. "Abdiel accuses Satan of being a "perfidious fraud" (5.880) after the first battle in heaven. He can then use this truth, this reveal, like the role models of *Gesta* and *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth* to help restore the divine authority of the monarchy. Abdiel's reason, his loyalty and faith allows him to counter Satan's equivocation. He cannot stand by and see angels led astray,[132] "O argument blasphemous, false and proud!" (5.809). He also connects heresy, and impiety with ambiguity, "impious obloquie" (5.813). In denying Satan's lies, Abdiel echoes the same language Satan used to earlier in Book 5, "to binde with Laws the free, / And equal over equals to let Reigne," (5.819-820), "libertie" (5.823), "equals over equals" (5.832). "Law" is also repeated reinforcing the idea of subservience and natural order, referenced in to "to binde with Laws the free" (5.819), "Law to God" (5.822), and "His Laws our Laws" (5.844). Abdiel also emphasizes servitude, "shall bend the knee" (5.817), and the need to obey the authority and structure of heaven. Through truthful speech he reveals the lie in Satan's speech and reasserts and restores, the natural, divine order. This ability to resist and reason is also what makes him a role model within the epic, in contrast to Satan.

As we have seen in previous chapters, devilish leadership can be countered by good role models and equivocation can be countered by truth. Michael's final words to Adam and Eve in Book 12 frame the final lessons to be gained from Satan and others like him. The ultimate legacy of Satan's demonic leadership, speech, and rebellion is that evil

---

[132] For more on this see David Loewenstein's 2013 *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature and Culture.*

is now loose in the world. In Michael's narration of the future, Satan's legacy is intertwined with Adam's and all of mankind's. Everyone now has a choice to make, to choose God and his natural authority or to pursue their own ambition. As Michael's narrative shows, Nimrod suffers from the same sin as Satan, a "proud ambitious heart" and it is this sin that leads to rebellion. He rejects the ideas of equality and fraternal state, prized by the pious and loyal as we saw with the angels. His creation of Babel, "Empire tyrannous," a "second Sovrantie" can be read as a parallel for Satan and Pandæmonium. By speaking truth, not the equivocation of the witches' prophecy in *Macbeth,* Michael's purpose is that Adam and Eve will learn from these examples. In this way, Michael's visions of the future recall the Mirror of Princes genre from Chapter One. The lesson is not that man is immune to devilish leaders and diabolical rebels after the fall but that they can learn from history in order to earn their redemption.

Within the logic of *Paradise Lost* God and Son are the only true role models for behavior and leadership. Placed in a historical context, men are fallible and can only be imperfect role models, as Michael's narrative in Books 11 and 12 prove with the stories of Ham (12.101), Abraham as "one faithful man" (12.113), Joseph (12.160), and Moses (12.161). Like the angels, man may fail but through loyalty, faith, and subservience, can try again to serve God best. God and faith are the only answer, an idea that Milton revisits in *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes* where both texts emphasize God and faith as the only answer to mortal problems.[133] Yet even simple faith is not enough as man must also be obedient and repentant.

---

[133] For more on this, see Joanne Therese Dempsey's 1981 *Paradise Regained: The Aesthetic of Obedience,* William B. Hunter Jr.'s 1971 "The Obedience of Christ in

The Mechanism of the Restoration of Order is Obedience

The mechanism of the restoration of the divine monarchy is a rejection of devilish leadership, demonic and manipulative speech, infernal council, rebellion, and embracing true, meritorious leaders. Again and again, *Paradise Lost* highlights that the lesson to be learned is to not disobey, to not rebel. In Book 3 the dialogue between the Creator and the Son revisits and reframes the issues of revolt, disobedience, and rebellion, presenting how Adam and Eve will recover from their actions. The Creator says:

> for I will cleer thir senses dark,
>
> What may suffice, and soft'n stonie hearts
>
> To pray, repent, and bring obedience due.
>
> To Prayer, repentance, and obedience due,
>
> Though but endevord with sincere intent,
>
> Mine ear shall not be slow, mine eye not shut. (3.188-193)

God presents the actions necessary for mankind to redeem themselves. They must pray and repent to become obedient again. Here the "sincere intent" is necessary to repent. The Creator's word choice presents the ending, their repentance as a foregone conclusion despite arguments of choice. The Creator will "cleer thir senses dark" so while Adam and Eve will pray, then repent, they are only capable of doing so because of the actions of the

---

Paradise Regained," Sunwoo Jin's 2005 "Imitatio Christi the Son as Exemplar in *Paradise Regained,*" Nicola Learmonth's 2006 *Definitions of Obedience in Paradise Regained,* J. T. Lorin's 2010 *They Actively Serve Who Stand and Wait: The Rudiment of Faithful Obedience Rousing Patient Activity in Paradise Regained and Samson Agonistes,* Anne Prescott's 1982 *Obedience in Paradise Regained and Samson Agonistes,* Joseph Tomba's 1977 *Temptation and Heroic Obedience in Paradise Regained,* David V. Urban's 2015 "John Milton, Paradox, and the Atonement: Heresy, Orthodoxy, and the Son's Whole-Life Obedience," and Thomas Irish Watt's 2011 *Milton's Visionary Obedience.*

Creator. This manipulation, of language and action, is the inverse of Satan's manipulation.

According to the epic submission to divine authority is the key to true repentance. Adam and Eve must be subservient in their new lives, "the form of servant to assume" (10.214) which echoes the language of Philippians 2:7 "but emptied Himself, taking the form of a bond-servant, and being made in the likeness of men." Recalling the Creator's dialogue with the Son in Book 3 Adam and Eve must honestly serve "Their penance" (10.550). The labor required of Adam and Eve after the Fall is representative of the penance they must do to continue to prove their repentance and submission to God. Adam's labor consists of working the land, and Eve is sentenced to endure the pain of childbirth. Both are forms of labor which imply a certain amount of pain. They can both be read as "natural" labors connected to the land in contrast to the urban labor required to build Pandemonium. If the devils' work and labor is a pale imitation when contrasted against Christ's work in Chapter Two, here the work, labor, and penance Adam and Eve must do to earn their repentance is "true" work. Adam and Eve must labor to earn their redemption and ultimately the future redemption of the English people. There is never a single choice to be made but rather an ongoing series of choices that must continually be informed by knowledge and experience and worked towards. Adam and Eve once they leave Paradise must build on their initial repentance and continue to make good choices and not sin. They must labor to prove they deserved this redemption with their labor to prove that the English nation deserves to be rewarded by God. God and the Son are the role models to inspire faith, but Adam, and to a lesser extent Eve, their labors, their ability and willingness to repent, is the mechanism for the restoration of order, and the

future of mankind. Adam understands that work in the form of spiritual reflection and agrarian labor will be part of his penance Adam's willingness to earn his repentance is what demonstrates that he is worthy of it.

Adam and Eve must submit to God to be forgiven and recognize the authority of Heaven:

> they forthwith to the place
> Repairing where he judg'd them prostrate fell
> Before him reverent, and both confess'd
> Humbly thir faults, and pardon beg'd, with tears
> Watering the ground, and with thir sighs the Air
> Frequenting, sent from hearts contrite, in sign
> Of sorrow unfeign'd, and humiliation meek. (10.1098-1104)

They must "humbly" (10.1101) confess their faults, beg, be contrite, and sincerely show sorrow and humility to be forgiven. It is only once they do that they earn the right to see the future, to know the consequences of their actions. Adam is grateful for Michael's vision (11. 370), "To show thee what shall come in future days / To thee and to thy offspring" (11.357-8). As a properly contrite man he understands that the suffering (11.375) of his offspring is necessary for his actions, but also hopes they will prove themselves worthy of God's forgiveness. Again, Milton emphasizes that to "yield" and "submit" (11.526) is the key to Adam's future. This choice, this submission, this repentance is what makes Adam, and by association Eve, worthy of God and the Son's inheritance. Worden argues that for Milton the freedom of choice to sin but also to repent makes them capable of being worthy of England (396). The emphasis here is that

humanity sins (and will sin again, of course) but the repeated choice of Adam and Eve's descendants to repent, like their "Grand Parents," is just as significant to their, read England's, material and spiritual prosperity.

Throughout *Paradise Lost* political and physical structures are both highlighted and rejected. The power and physical structures of heaven are described, then rejected by the rebelling angels. These same structures are then mimicked in hell. Satan replicates the same power hierarchies while attempting to create Pandemonium. Yet the structures of family, of community, are perverted within the epic. The fallen certainly believe they are a community, forming a social structure but there is no description of these relationships that approaches how God and the Son's relationship, dialogue, and interaction is described. The community formed in hell is one based in politics, as the speech and structure of the infernal councils highlight. By the end of the epic, these micro-structures have been rejected as flawed but the macro structure, the idea of faith and church as community, is embraced. The last lines of the epic reinforce this:

> They looking back, all th' Eastern side beheld
> Of Paradise, so late thir happie seat,
> Wav'd over by that flaming Brand, the Gate
> With dreadful Faces throng'd and fierie Armes:
> Som natural tears they drop'd, but wip'd them soon;
> The World was all before them, where to choose
> Thir place of rest, and Providence thir guide:
> They hand in hand with wandring steps and slow,
> Through Eden took thir solitarie way. (12.641-649)

Adam and Eve are exiled from the structure of Paradise, which is defined for its physical structures, "th' Eastern side," "thir happie seat." They must walk through the "Gate" as part of their punishment, but as the path to their redemption. In Book 3, as Satan wanders around heaven, he comments on the physical structures, the gates, the stairs, the doors. These descriptions are the beginning of Satan's descent, into folly, but also his inevitable defeat. Here, Adam and Eve have no clear path, "They hand in hand with wandring steps and slow, / Through Eden took thir solitarie way." They wander, with no direction, with no structures to mark their way. This absence of structures highlights the replacement of physical structures, both buildings such as their bower, and politics such as the devils take part in, with the structures of faith. The only structure that matters now after their fall is the community of faith and obedience they will build.

The final lesson of Satan in *Paradise Lost* is that the consequences of devilish leadership are horrific and long-reaching but can ultimately be thwarted through obedience to a divinely appointed leader's natural authority. Mimicking inherently demonic power structures and trusting decisions to a democratic collective is dangerous and not true creation but the real will always triumph over the simulacrum. Rebellion is an act of betrayal against God / Lord but can be defeated by loyal warriors who use logic and faith to counter the equivocation and deceptive speech that is the tools used to incite rebellion. If mankind chooses subservience and obedience to God, then natural and divine order can be restored. If good, Christian Englishmen and women are careful to learn the lessons of history about the dangers of devilish leadership, infernal councils, and diabolical rebellion, they can learn to place their faith and obedience in God and the Son, then England will succeed and thrive

Conclusion: "Hell is empty and all the devils are here"[134]

Each of these texts, *Gesta regum Anglorum, Þe Deulis Parlement, 1 Henry IV, Macbeth,* and *Paradise Lost*, imagines the political nature of England in specific ways and use devils to do it. Malmesbury imagines England as a single unbroken narrative, writing a fictional founding to ensure that leaders make the best decisions for the nation. He consciously creates a vision of England led by great leaders who are wise enough to learn lessons from the past by simply by writing it the way he wishes it was. *Paradise Lost* functions in a similar way, with Milton conscientiously constructing arguments about tyranny, the republic, and the monarchy. The anonymous author of *Þe Deulis Parlement* and Shakespeare in *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth* are not as self-aware, so while these works illustrate how the authors grapple with issues of democracy, what it means to be English, and the threats presented by speech and rebellion, they do not do it as consciously and not necessarily as part of larger national projects. While the "devils" in Malmesbury, *1Henry IV,* and *Macbeth* are human, their political nature, their function as adversary, and their threat to the English nation-state connect them to the more traditional devils in *ÞDP* and *Paradise Lost.* While the texts in this dissertation cover roughly five hundred years, the events in these texts cover all of human history— Milton begins in Genesis, while Malmesbury begins with the arrival of the Angles in 449. Likewise, the historical figure of Mac Bethad mac Findláich was born in 1005 and Owain Glyn Dŵr lived from 1355-1415. When we place these texts in the order they were written we can trace the patterns of how the political devil has been used by authors to respond to tensions, anxieties, and fears associated with threats to national stability. When we place

---

[134] *The Tempest,* 1.2.215

the events of the texts in chronological order, *Paradise Lost, Gesta, Macbeth, 1 Henry IV,* and *Þe Deulis Parlement,* a longer pattern emerges which highlights concerns over defining national identity, one's place in a political world, and how to confront and respond to internal threats. Despite the frequent use of both the devil as figure and demonizing alterns in rhetoric and polemic, the inherently political purpose and effect of the devil in literature has not been studied, a gap this dissertation seeks to fill.

It is impossible these days to turn on a television, open a newspaper, or log onto to social media and not see one group continuing the rhetoric of demonizing another to serve its own interests. We live in a world where Donald Trump is a president endorsed by the once Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, and Britain votes to leave the European Union over the threat of Muslim immigrants, and marginalized groups. In the wake of these events, Irish citizens have railed against being defined as British in a New York Times article, a post-Brexit a vote for Scottish independence may pass, and more and more national identity is defined by negation: not people of color, not Muslims, not immigrants, not poor, not liberal or elitist.

In his inauguration speech Donald Trump referenced putting "America First" in his policies, a clear appeal to the nostalgic views of yesteryear that contributed to his election. Yet "America First" is also a reference to the American-based Nazi movement of the 1930s, a group who blamed European Jews for the treatment they received, as well as larger global problems. In his speech and presentation, Trump became the latest participant in a long line to define his own nationalism at the expense of others. The Brexit movement in England can be described along the same lines. Britain exiting the European Union was sold under the idea that it would be better for the British people,

ensuring that jobs and goods stayed home, with the British populace. Furthermore, the argument made was that Britain's economy would prosper once they were not spending money they could not afford on the EU. If only they could rid their nation of foreigners, of alterns, then British citizens could finally thrive.

The demonizing of marginalized groups to define both American and British nationalism resulted in disastrous consequences for people of color and Muslims. According to an *Independent* article from October 2016, hate crimes rose 41% after the Brexit vote. A *Huffington Post* article from February 2017 reports a rise in hate crimes in America after Trump's election. There were sixty-nine bomb threats called in to Jewish community centers during the month of January 2017, mosques were vandalized, women in hijabs faced harassment and abuse on the street and on public transportation. People of color had notes left on their cars, and have been told to their faces to "Go home, this is Trump's America now." The clearly different "not us" has been constructed as the enemy, the adversary, the threat.

In a climate of "fake news" where the President of the United States and his administration blatantly lies about items easily fact-checked, when the White House is compared to the Ministry of Truth, and where the President's rhetoric often calls openly for violence and racism, when then Candidate Trump called on his followers to commit violence in his name, attacking those who opposed him, when he made false promises, it is easy to see the continuation of the idea that speech is dangerous and possibly demonic. A National Rifle Association video that was released in April 2017 and then went viral in June 2017, ended with what many felt was an open call for open, armed rebellion by its members.

One of the main goals of "fake news" seems to be to identify who the bogeyman is and demonize anyone we could define as "altern." In the past, these "Others" were often studied through the colonial lens of fetishizing or eroticizing, yet they were as often demonized, and these two views fall along gender lines, with female "Others" as ones to tame, often by stripping them of the very outer trappings that marked them as other or through sexual conquest. While female alterns threatened domestic spaces and national unity through this, male alterns are usually constructed as the real threat. It is telling that while women are often demonized for their association with the devil, English literature does not feature female demons. All the demons in my survey of English literature and referenced in this dissertation are male.

On the surface, an analysis of the devil in medieval and early modern literature might seem far removed from these current events. Yet white nationalists and neo-Nazis such as Steve Bannon, who served for six months as an advisor to the President of the United States, often look to the historical past as a way of justifying their viewpoints and actions. Jessica Langer argues in "Fake News and the Nation as Imagined Community" that communities are built in part "on the vernacular that our officials and representatives use." As we saw in both Chapters One and Two, how enemies of England are named, how they are constructed as demonic, is key to the argument. As Dr. Helen Young as written about in her book *Race and Popular Fantasy Literature: Habits of Whiteness* as well as on the *Public Medievalist* blogs, there is a myth that the medieval period was white, and this racism coupled with a nostalgia of the past supports their narrative. Recent events have shown that white nationalists often turn to the medieval period as justification for their movements, as with the Portland attacker who yelled "Heil

Vinland" before his attacks, as David Perry has covered for the Washington Post. Erik Weiskott has also written about the connections between modern feelings of "Feeling 'British'" with Britain's postcolonial past, arguing that there's a paradox that exists with Britain always having been "a postcolonial space" and the insistence on particular fictional narratives of Britishness. More and more scholars of the medieval and early modern period are conducting more public scholarship as a way to counter the misuse and misreadings of an all-white history that Neo-Nazis and other white nationalists seek to appropriate and use to further their own racist agendas. I hope in some small way, my work helps illuminate the artificial construction of the demonization of marginalized groups, and also helps counter these white nationalist fantasies. As we saw in Chapters Three and Four, seeking validation, or a safety from critique in the historical past is not a new idea. In both those chapters, writers set stories with high nationalistic stakes in the historical past to argue about the issues surrounding national identity in a unified Britain, in a way that avoids the problems of a Scottish king ruling over an England that is not unified with Scotland, and the dangers in criticizing monarchy and God given merit and power in the years following civil war and the Restoration.

Throughout English literature the devil is a vehicle for the political concerns, fears, and anxieties of the common people, shifting and evolving to represent different things at different points in time. In this dissertation, the devil represents and symbolizes the fear of the damage a problematic political leader can have on the fate of a nation. He also represents fears about the consequences of giving power to a democratic political structure. The devil embodies concerns over the threat political rebellion poses to the prosperity and successful future of a nation. This dissertation challenges ideas of studying

only a single time period, only medieval or early modern. It demonstrates the knowledge we gain when we look for patterns and trends and arguments across periodization. It also proves the richer picture we get of figures, texts, and historical moments if we combine the fields of history, literature, folklore and popular belief. My work highlights the way the construction of the demonic is largely artificial, dependent on biases of the storyteller, allowing us to identify and recognize them, hopefully enabling us to counter them. Finally, it contributes to conversations about how we construct national identity, often at the expense of others, and how we define self in an ever-changing world.

Taking a long view of the political English devil from *Gesta regum Anglorum* (1125) to *Paradise Lost* (1674) allows us to see trends and patterns that do not appear when we restrict scholarship to common periodizations and disciplines. When we examine how the devil is presented and used from Malmesbury's chronicle to Milton's epic we can see that there are similarities in how the devil is portrayed and the political and nationalistic arguments he makes. Devils make awful leaders, but the real danger they present is the ways they can affect and infect the populaces they lead into ruin. Parliament is inherently demonic because it privileges a democratic, collective political structure that attempts to replace divine authority, tempting others to follow false gods. Yet the potential for manipulation and deception in demonic speech may be the greatest threat of these councils. Rebellion is the greatest threat to a nation-state, but common people can counter it and contribute to the strength of their country by opposing devilish leadership. If they can trust only in the creation and authority of God, and remain loyal to their lord/Lord, redemption and success is possible

While it is useful to identify the elements that make up the common understanding of the English devil the most interesting arguments are found in the portrayals that counter this common understanding. By identifying the origin of each of these defining tropes, I proved that certain texts are microcosms of their historical and cultural moments and the arguments they make about nationalism. I demonstrated how these tropes and arguments are layers in later texts that invoke the common cultural understandings of who the devil is and what he represents. Political devil figures that counter rather than conform to the common understanding reveal fears, anxieties, and desires of a specific historical moment. This in turn allows us to tease out what is special or different about that moment and what this contributes to our knowledge of the historical and cultural moment, and provides a more comprehensive context and understanding. In addition to filling these gaps many of the texts I study have received little attention, *Gesta regum Anglorum* is rarely studied as literature, and historical scholarship focuses on the accuracy and sources rather than analyzing the text itself. Likewise, there is almost no scholarship that analyzes *Þe Deulis Perlament* outside of its revision of the Harrowing of Hell. I would love to see more scholarship focus on these lesser known texts. I believe there is more work to be done on how racial and sexualized “Others” make nationalist arguments, and how demonizing these figures contributes to and continues a cycle of postcolonial bias and prejudice.

One of the main contributions I believe my project makes is expanding how certain characters are analyzed. While origins of the Biblical devil have been explored as well as possible sources and analogues for Satan in *Paradise Lost*, the complete context and long history of characters such as the devil have not been studied. I believe that

applying folkloric knowledge to these literary characters can only enhance our understanding of these texts and the work they are doing. This cross-disciplinary approach has been neglected. Likewise, folklore studies often focuses on cultural practices, field studies, and more recently, folklore in film and literature. This means that English folkloric figures in literature have been largely neglected. For example, English fairies and folklore have not been examined in the forty years since Katherine Briggs contribution. I would like to take the methodology I have applied here and utilize it on the appearances of Death, Robin Hood, Fairies, and the Wild/Green Man in English literature reading these figures through a folkloric lens, and analyzing the arguments they make about England as a nation, and what they reveal about the people of the time. I would continue the methodology I have used here reading these figures for how they reflect their historical and cultural moments. I believe that examining these folkloric figures through this new approach not only provides a new avenue of folklore studies but also adds to our understanding of these pieces of literature.

While *Paradise Lost* is often considered for its theology, its commentary on the evils of monarchies, and its presentation of a very specific historical and cultural moment, many texts that present it in context, such as Stephen B. Dobranski's recent 2010 work, do not examine the role of the English devil as a defining context for the epic. Blake's famous quote about people knowing their Milton better than their Bible is overused and over-quoted in many ways. Despite this fact, few scholarly works look at why this is the case. What is it about Milton's story that makes it the one people choose to revise and reimagine? Why has Milton's narrative replaced and supplanted traditional religious narratives? Does Milton's narrative constitute secular religious mythology? If

so, what is the significance of this? How does Milton's characterization of Satan become the dominant narrative in popular imagination? Why has popular culture embraced the concept of a war in heaven as seen in movies like *Constantine, Legion, The Prophecy* and television shows like *Supernatural*? What do the revisions and re imaginings of Milton's mythology tell us about the historical and cultural moments of these popular culture productions? How are the nationalistic arguments of the English devil and *Paradise Lost* present in these reimaginings and revisions Whereas this project traced the English devil ending where the characterization freezes in *Paradise Lost,* I see a future project which will examine all the ways this figure is revised and reimagined after Milton and interrogate why his secular mythology replaces the Biblical one in the popular imagination.

Works Cited

Primary Texts

Anonymous. *The English devil: or, Cromwel and his monstrous witch discover'd at White-Hall: With the strange and damnable speech of this hellish monster, by way of revelation, touching king and kingdom; and a narrative of the infernal plots, inhumane actings, and barbarous conspiracies of this grand impostor, and most audacious rebel, that durst aspire from a brew-house to the throne, washing his accursed hands in the blood of his royal soveraign; and trampling over the heads of the most loyal subjects, making a foot-ball of a crown, and endeavouring utterly to extirpate the royal progeny, root and kinde, stem and stock.* London, 1660. *Early English Books Online*. 2015. Web. Accessed. 1 June 2015.

Brown, D. and A. Bell. *The History of France from the Origin of that Nation to the Year 1702: Containing, Besides All the Material Transactions in Peace and War, a Particular Account of the Steps Taken by Their Late Princes, to Subvert Their Civil Liberties, and to Extirpate the Reformed Religion ... To which is Added, the Antient and Present State of France, as to Its Constitution and Government, the Royal Family, the Nobility, and Offices Civil and Military &c.* London, 1702.

Clopper, Lawrence M. ed. *Records of Early English Drama: Chester*. Guelph: U of Toronto P, 1979.

Conlee, John, ed. *The Prose Merlin.* Kalamazoo: TEAMS: Middle English Text Series, 1998.

Crampton, Georgia Ronan ed. *The Shewings of Julian of Norwich*. Rochester U, 1994. 10 November 2013. Web. Accessed 1 August 2016.

Cursor Mundi (The Cursur O the World). A Northumbrian Poem of the XIVth Century in Four Versions. Ed. by Richard Morris. U of Michigan, 2006. Web. Accessed 1 August 2016.

Defoe, Daniel, et al. *The Political History of the Devil (1726)*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2005.

Davidson, Clifford, ed. *The York Corpus Christi Plays.* Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2011.

de Voragine, Jacobus. *The Golden Legend: Readings of the Saints.* Princeton UP, 2012.

"Decepcioun." *Middle English English Dictionary*. 2017. Web. Accessed 26 October 2017.

Derricke, John. *The image of Irelande with a discouerie of vvoodkarne, wherin is moste liuely expressed, the nature, and qualitie of the saied wilde Irishe woodkarne, their notable aptnesse, celeritie, and pronesse to rebellion, and by waie of argumente is manifested their originall, and ofspryng, their descent and pedigree: also their habite and apparell, is there plainly showne. The execrable life, and miserable death of Rorie Roge, that famous archtraitour to God and the croune (otherwise called Rorie Oge) is like wise discribed. Lastlie the commyng in of Thyrlaghe Leonaghe the greate Oneale of Irelande, with the effecte of his submission, to the right honourable Sir Henry Sidney (Lorde Deputie of the saied lande) is thereto adioyned. Made and deuised by Ihon Derricke, anno 1578. and now published and set forthe by the saied authour this present yere of our Lorde 1581. for pleasure and delight of the well disposed reader.* Imprinted at London:

By [J. Kingston for] Ihon Daie, 1581. Early English Books Online. 3 December 2016.

"Douay-Rheims Bible, Latin Vulgate." *Vulgate.org.* 2017. Web. Accessed 24 September 2017.

"Equivocation." *Etymology Online.* 2017. Web. Accessed 26 October 2017.

"Equivocation n1." *OED Online*. *Oxford English Dictionary*. 17 December 2015. Web. Accessed 26 October 2017.

"Equivocation," *Middle English English Dictionary*. 2017. Web. Accessed 26 October 2017.

"Fiend n." *OED Online*. *Oxford English Dictionary*. 2016. Web. Accessed 26 October 2017.

Greene, Robert, and G. B. Harrison. *The Honourable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. London: R. Holden & Co, 1927. 2016. Web. 1 August 2016.

"Hag, n.1." *OED Online*. *Oxford English Dictionary*. 17 December 2015. Web. Accessed 1 August 2016.

Hall, George. *The black and terrible vvarning piece: or, a scourge to Englands rebellion. Truly representing, the horrible iniquity of the times; the dangerous proceedings of the ranters, and the holding of no Resurrection by the shakers, in Yorkshire and elsewhere. With the several judgements of the most high and eternal Lord God, upon all usurpers, who deny His law, and His truth; and the manner how 130 children were taken away by the devil, and never seen no more; and divers others taken, rent, torn, and cast up and down from room to room, by strange and dreadfull spirits, appearing in the shapes of, a black boar, a roaring lyon, an

English statesman, and a Roman fryer. Extracted out of the elaborate works of Bishop Hall, and Sir Kenelm Digby; and published for general satisfaction, to all Christian princes, states, and common-wealths in Europe. London, 1653. *Early English Books Online*. 1 June 2015. Web. Accessed 1 August 2016.

Hammer, Jacob, ed. *Geoffrey of Monmouth, Historia regum Britanniae, a variant version.* Medieval Academy Books, No. 57, 1957.

Hasenfratz, Robert ed. "Ancrene Wisse." *Robbins Library Digital Projects*. 2000. Web. Accessed 1 August 2016.

Heywood, Thomas. *The Life of Merlin: Surnamed Ambrosius His Prophecies and Predictions Interpreted and Their Truth Made Good By Our English Annals: Being a Chronological History of All the Kings and Memorable Passages of the Kingdom, From Brute to the Reign of King Charles.* London: Lackington, Allen, and Co, 1813.

Horstmann, Carl, ed. *The Early South-English legendary, or, Lives of Saints: MS Laud 108.* New York: C. Scribner & Co. 1887. 2 May 2014. Web. Accessed 1 August 2016.

I. E. *A letter from a souldier of good place in Ireland, to his friend in London touching the notable victorie of her Maiesties forces there, against the Spaniards, andIrish rebels: and of the yeelding vp of Kynsale, and other places there held by the Spanyards.* London: Imprinted [by T. Creede?] for Symon Waterson, 1602. Early English Books Online. 3 December 2016.

Ingram, Reginald ed. *Records of Early English Drama: Coventry*. Guelph: U of Toronto P, 1981.

"Irregular, Adj. and N." *OED Online*. *Oxford English Dictionary*. 2016. Web. Accessed 5 Nov. 2016.

J. G. E. *Englands hope, against Irish hate.* At London: Printed by VV.VV. for Thomas Heyes, 1600. Early English Books Online. 3 December 2016.

Jonson, Ben, and Peter Happé. *The Devil Is an Ass.* Manchester, England: New York, 1994.

Johnston, Alexandra F. and Margaret Roguson ed. *Records of Early English Drama: York*. Guelph: U of Toronto P, 1979.

Kastan, David Scott ed. and John Milton. *Paradise Lost (Kastan Edition).* Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2005.

Kempe, Margery. *The Book of Margery Kempe.* New York: Penguin, 1985.

Klausner, David N. ed. *Records of Early English Drama: Herefordshire and Worcestershire*. Guelph: U of Toronto P, 1990.

"Knak." *Middle English English Dictionary*. 2017. Web. Accessed 26 October 2017.

Knight, Stephen and Thomas H. Ohlgren. ed. *Robin Hood and Other Outlaw Tales. Robbins Library Digital Projects.* 2000. Web. Accessed 9 June 2017.

Lewalski, Barbara K. *Paradise Lost.* Malden: Blackwell, 2007.

Langland, William. *Piers Plowman. Robbins Library Digital Projects.* 2000. Web. Accessed 1 August 2016.

Malmesbury, William. *Chronicle of the Kings of England: From the Earliest Period to the Reign of King Stephen (Gesta regum Anglorum).* Trans. J. A. Giles. New York: Henry G. Bohn, 1846.

Marlowe, Christopher. “The Tragedy of Doctor Faustus.” *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Ed. M. H. Abrams. New York: Norton, 2000. 1127-1165.

Marx, C. W. *The Devil’s Parliament and The Harrowing of Hell and Destruction of Jerusalum.* Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 1993.

Nelson, Alan H. ed. *Records of Early English Drama: Cambridge*. Guelph: U of Toronto P, 1989.

“Parliament.” *Middle English Dictionary*. U of Michigan. 2014. 9 June 2017. Web. Accessed 9 June 2017.

“Poetics by Aristotle.” *The Internet Classics Archive*, 2009.Web. Date Accessed 29 Oct. 2016.

Poston, Rebecca and Michael Niles. “Folger Digital Texts.” *Folger Library.* 2016 Web. Accessed 26 Nov. 2016.

Scot, Reginald. *Scots Discovery of Witchcraft: Proving the Common Opinions of Witches Contracting with Devils, Spirits, or Familiars ...: and Their Power to Kill, Torment, and Consume ... to Be but Imaginary ...: Wherein Also, the Lewd Unchristian Practices of Witchmongers ... Is Notably Detected ...: Whereunto Is Added a Treatise Upon the Nature and Substance of Spirits and Devils ...: All Written and Published in Anno 1584*. London: Printed by E. Cotes and are to be sold by Thomas Williams, 1654.

Shakespeare, Williams. *1 Henry IV. Folger Digital Texts.* 2017. Web. Accessed. 21 October 2016.

-----. *Macbeth. Folger Digital Texts.* 2017. Web. Accessed. 21 October 2016.

Sugano, Douglas. ed. *The N-Town Plays. Robbins Library Digital Projects.* 2000. Web. Accessed 9 June 2017.

T. B. *The devil's an asse: or, the policy of hell made plain to the dwellers on earth Being a serious reflection upon the late inhumane rebellious warr. Wherein is laid open the folly as well as wickednesse of that horrid sin of rebellion. By T.B.* London, 1660. *Early English Books Online*. 2015. Web. Accessed 1 August 2016.

Taylor, John. *Grand Plutoes remonstrance, or, The Devill horn-mad at Roundheads and Brownists. Wherein his Hellish Maiestie (by advice of his great counsell, Eacus, Minos & Radamanthus, with his beloved brethren, Agdistis, Beliall, Incubus & Succubus) is pleased to declare, 1. How far he differs from Round-head, rattle-head, or prickeare. 2. His copulation with a holy sister. 3. His decre [sic] affection to romish Catholikes, and hate to Protestants. 4. His oration to the rebells.* London, 1642. *Early English Books Online*. 2015. Web. Accessed 1 June 2015.

Wasson, John M. ed. *Records of Early English Drama: Devon*. Buffalo: U of Toronto P, 1986.

"Werk." *Middle English Dictionary*. U of Michigan. 2014. Web. Accessed 26 Dec. 2016.

"Wild, Adj. and N." *OED Online*. *Oxford English Dictionary*. 2016. Web. Accessed 5 Nov. 2016.

William of Malmesbury. *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis Monachi Gesta Regum Anglorum: Volume 1*. Sumptibus Societatis, 1840. *Internet Archive*. 2016. Web. Accessed 24 Sept. 2016.

Secondary Texts

Aasand, Hardin. "Shakespeare, Machiavelli, and Montaigne: Power and Subjectivity from *Richard III* to *Hamlet*." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 35.3 (2004): 909-911.

Greenblatt, Stephen et al., ed. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature, Volume B: The Sixteenth Century/The Early Seventeenth Century*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2005.

Achinstein, Sharon. *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.

Agari, Masahiko. "Logical Equivocation in *Paradise Lost.*" *Language and Style in English Literature: Essays in Honour of Michio Masui.* New York: Peter Lang. 542-556.

Almond, Philip C. *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England: Contemporary Texts and Their Cultural Contexts.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities.* New York: Verso, 1991.

Anderson, Maxine K. "The Death of a Mind: A Study of Shakespeare's Richard III." *The Journal of Analytical Psychology* 51.5 (2006): 701-716.

Andrea, Bernadette. "'A Noble Troop of Strangers': Masques of Blackness in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII.*" *Shakespeare and Immigration.* Surrey: Ashgate, 2014.

Armitage, David. "John Milton: Poet against Empire." *Milton and Republicanism.* Armitage, David, Armand Himy, and Quentin Skinner, eds. New York: Cambridge UP, 1995. 206-225.

Babb, Lawrence. “Hamlet, Melancholy, and the Devil.” *Modern Language Notes* 59.2 (Feb., 1944): 120-122.

Bailey, Michael David. *Battling Demons: Witchcraft, Heresy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages.* University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2003.

Baker, Christopher. “Saint Peter and Macbeth’s Porter.” *Ben Jonson Journal: Literary Contexts in the Age of Elizabeth, James and Charles* 18.2 (2011): 233-253.

Baker, Cynthia. *Jew.* New Brunswick: Rutgers, 2017.

Baker, David J. *Between Nations: Shakespeare, Spenser, Marvell, and the Question of Britain.* Stanford: Stanford UP, 1997.

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhaĭlovich. *Rabelais and His World*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.

Barker, Juliet R. *1381: The Year of the Peasants’ Revolt*. Boston: Belknap P, 2014.

----. *England, Arise: The People, the King, and the Great Revolt of 1381.* New York City: Little, Brown Book Group Limited, 2015.

Bartels, Emily. *Speaking of the Moor: From Alcazar to Othello.* Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2008.

Bates, Zachary A. “James I and British Identity: The Development of a British Identity from 1542-1689.” *DISCOVERY: Georgia State Honors College Undergraduate Research Journal* 2:2 (June 2914): n.p.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1994.

Beehler, Paul Alexander Joseph. *Reforming Religious Representatives: Shakespeare’s Disruptive Historical Acts.* Riverside: U of California P, 2000.

Bennett, Joan S. "God, Satan, and King Charles: Milton's Royal Portraits." *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 92.3 (1977): 441-57.

Bennett, Judith M. and Amy M. Froide, eds. *Singlewomen in the European Past 1250-1800.* Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1999.

Berthold, Dennis. "The Concept of Merit in *Paradise Lost.*" *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 15.1 (1975): 153-167.

Bertman, Stephen. "The Antisemitic Origin of Michelangelo's Horned Moses." *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* 27.4 (Summer 2009): 95-106.

Biberman, Matthew. *Masculinity, Anti-Semitism, and Early modern English Literature: From the Satanic to the Effeminate Jew.* Surrey: Ashgate Publication, 2004.

Bjork, Olin Robert. *Interfacing Milton: The Supplementation of Paradise Lost*. The University of Texas at Austin, 2008. Dissertation.

Bloom, Harold. *Caliban.* New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1992.

Boas, Frederick S. "Joan of Arc in Shakespeare, Schiller, and Shaw." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 2.1 (1951): 35-45.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Translated by Richard Nice. New York: Cambridge UP, 1977.

Bradley, A., and John Bayley. *Shakespearean Tragedy*. London: Penguin UK, 2005.

Bradshaw, Brendan, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley. *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Breuer, Heidi. *Crafting the Witch: Gendering Magic in Medieval and Early Modern England.* New York: Routledge, 2009.

Bristol, Michael D. *Carnival and Theatre: Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England.* New York: Methuen, 1985.

"British, Adj. and n." *OED Online*. *Oxford English Dictionary*. 2017. Web. Accessed 1 June 2017.

Brljak, Vladimir. "Early Comments on Milton's Anti-Trinitarianism." *Milton Quarterly* 49.1 (2015): 44-50.

Brown, John Russell. "'Extravagant and Wheeling Strangers': The Outlandish in Shakespeare's Tragedies." *International Shakespeare: The Tragedies.* Bologna: BLUEB, 1996. 53-63.

Brown, Keith. "The Imperial Experiment 1603-37." *Kingdom or Province?: Scotland and the Regal Union, 1603-1715* (1992): 86-111.

Bruce, Maurice, and Katherine H. Terrell. *The Anglo-Scottish Border and the Shaping of Identity, 1300-1600.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Bryant, J. A., Jr. "Aaron and the Pattern of Shakespeare's Villains." *Renaissance Papers* VOLUME NUMBER? (1984): 29-36.

Bryant, Nigel, trans. *Merlin and the Grail: The Trilogy of Prose Romances Attributed to Robert de Boron.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2001.

Bryson, Michael. "'His Tyranny Who Reigns': The Biblical Roots of Divine Kingship and Milton's Rejection of 'Heav'n's King'." *Milton Studies* 43 (2004): 111-44.

---. "The Mysterious Darkness of Unknowing." *Paradise Lost and the God Beyond Names.* Duquesne: Duquesne UP, 2007. 183-212.

Buccola, Regina. *Fairies, Fractious Women, and the Old Faith: Fairy Lore in Early Modern British Drama and Culture.* Susquehanna: Susquehanna UP, 2006.

Burnett, Mark Thornton. *Constructing 'Monsters' in Shakespearean Drama and Early Modern Culture.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Burstein, Sona Rosa. "The Harrowing of Hell." *Folklore* 39:2 (June. 30, 1928): 113-132.

Butler, E. M., and Eliza Marian Butler. *The Myth of the Magus*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Butler, George F. "Milton's Briareos, Satan's Rebellion, and the Primacy of Natale Conti's Mythologiae in Paradise Lost." *Notes and Queries* 46:3 (1999): 330-331.

Cacicedo, Alberto. "Othello, Stranger in a Strange Land." *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies* 18:1 (2016): 7-27.

Calisch, Edward N. *The Jew in English Literature, as Author and as Subject.* New York: Kennikat P, 1969.

Campbell, Laura J. "The Devil's in the Detail: Translating Merlin's Father from the *Merlin En Prose* in Paulino Pieri's *Storia Di Merlino*." *Arthuriana* 23.2 (2013): 35-51.

Canino, Catherine. "The Discourse of Hell: *Paradise Lost* and the Irish Rebellion." *Milton Quarterly* 32.1 (1998): 15-23.

Cardwell, Samuel. "'The People Whom He Foreknew': The English as a Chosen People in Bede's 'Historia Ecclesiastica'." *Journal of the Australian Early Medieval Association* 11 (2015): 41-66.

Caswell, Wynema Burns. *Synod of Gods: The Infernal Council in Book Two of Milton's Paradise Lost.* Thesis. University of Oklahoma, 1959.

Chakravarty, Urvashi. "More Then Kin, Less Than Kind: Similitude, Strangeness, and Early Modern English Homonationalism." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 67.1 (Spring 2016): 14-29.

Charbonneau, Joanne A. "From Devil to Saint: Transformations in Sir Gowther." *The Matter of Identity in Medieval Romance.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2002. 21-28.

Coe, Charles Norton. *Demi-Devils: The Character of Shakespeare's Villains.* New York: Bookman Associates, 1963.

Cohen, Derek. "Macbeth's Rites of Violence: Essay and Review." *Shakespeare in Southern Africa* 23 (2011): 55-63.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity.* Oakland: U of California P, 1999.

Coleman, James W. *Black Male Fiction and the Legacy of Caliban.* Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2001.

Colgan, Paul. "Shakespeare 'Created Irish Stereotype.'" *The Times (UK).* 26 October 2016. Web. Accessed 1 December 2016.

Cool, James Frederic. *The Infernal Council in the Sixteenth-Century Biblical Epic.* New Haven: Yale U, 1978. Dissertation.

Cox, John D. "Devils and Power in Marlowe and Shakespeare." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 23 (Jan., 1993): 46-64.

---. *The Devil and the Sacred in English Drama 1350-1642.* New York: Cambridge UP, 2000.

---. "The Devil and Society in the English Mystery Plays." *Comparative Drama* 28.4 (Winter 1994-95): 407-438.

Craig, Leon H. *Of Philosophers and Kings: Political Philosophy in Shakespeare's Macbeth and King Lear.* Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2001.

Crawford, Julie. *Marvelous Protestantism: Monstrous Births in Post Reformation England.* Baltimore: JHUP, 2011.

Crocco, Francesco. *Literature and the Growth of British Nationalism: The Influence of Romantic Poetry and Bardic Criticism.* Jefferson: McFarland, 2014.

Cross, James E., and Denis. Brearley. *Two Old English Apocrypha and Their Manuscript Source: The Gospel of Nichodemus and the Avenging of the Saviour.* New York: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Cunningham, Karen. *Imaginary Betrayals: Subjectivity and the Discourses of Treason in Early Modern England.* Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2002.

Darr, Orna Alyagon. *Marks of an Absolute Witch: Evidentiary Dilemmas in Early Modern England.* Burlington: Ashgate, 2011

Davies, Anthony. "'An Extravagant and Wheeling Stranger of Here and Everywhere. Characterising *Othello* on Film: Exploring Seven Film Adaptations." *Shakespeare in Southern Africa* 23 (2011): 11-19.

Davies, R. "Shakespeare's Glendower and Owain Glyn Dwr." *Historian* 66 (2000): 22-25.

Davies, R. R. *The First English Empire: Power and Identities in the British Isles 1093-1343*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

Davis-Secord, Jonathan. "Revising Race in Laȝamon's *Brut.*" *Journal of English and German Philology (JEGP)* 116.2 (April 2017): 156-181.

Dean, Christopher. *A Study of Merlin in English Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present Day*. Lewiston: E. Mellen P, 1992.

---. *Arthur of England: English Attitudes to King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. Toronto: U of Toronto P., 1987.

De Cillia, Rudolf, Martin Reisigl, and Ruth Wodak. "The Discursive Construction of National Identities." *Discourse & Society* 10.2 (1999): 149-73.

Dempsey, Joanne Therese. *Paradise Regained: The Aesthetic of Obedience.* Harvard University, 1981. Dissertation.

Dendle, Peter. *Satan Unbound: The Devil in Old English Narrative Literature.* Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2001.

---. "The Demonological Landscape of the 'Soloman and Saturn Cycle." *English Studies* 4 (1999): 281-292.

---. *Demon Possession in Anglo-Saxon England.* Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2014.

Deroux, M. "The Blackness Within: Early Modern Color-Concept, Physiology and Aaron the Moor in Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus." *Mediterranean Studies* 19.1 (2010): 86-101.

Despres, Denise L. "Immaculate Flesh and the Social Body: Mary and the Jews." *Jewish History* 12.1 (Spring 1998): 47-69.

Dobranski, Stephen B. *The Cambridge Introduction to Milton*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2012.

Donnelly, Colleen. "The Syntactic Counterplot of the Devils' Debates and God's Council." *Language and Style: An International Journal* 19.1 (1986): 58-73.

Dundes, Alan. *The Blood Libel Legend: A Casebook in Anti-Semitic Folklore*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991.

Duran, Angelica. "The Last Stages of Education: *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*." *Milton Quarterly* 34.4 (2000):102-116.

Durham, C. W. "'Suffering for Truth's Sake': The Conflict between Abdiel and Satan in Paradise Lost". *CEA Critic* 68.1/2 (2006): 60-66.

---. "'To Stand Approv'd in Sight of God': Abdiel, Obedience, and Hierarchy in *Paradise Lost*." *Milton Quarterly* 26.1 (1992): 15-20.

Eco, Umberto, ed. *On Ugliness.* New York: Rizzoli, 2007.

Edwards, Kathryn A. *Werewolves, Witches, and Wandering Spirits Traditional Belief and Folklore in Early Modern Europe*. Kirksville: Truman State UP, 2002.

Edwards, Philip. *Threshold of a Nation: A Study in English and Irish Drama*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1983.

Ehrman, Bart D., and Zlatko Pleše. *The Apocryphal Gospels: Texts and Translations.* New York: Oxford UP, 2011.

Elliott, Philip L. "Merlin and His Demon in 'The Eve of St. Agnes.'" *Furman Studies* 25.1 (1976): 59-64.

"English, Adj. and Adv. And n." *OED Online*. *Oxford English Dictionary*. 2017. Web. Accessed 1 June 2017.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. Sterling: Pluto P, 2002.

Erussard, Laurence. "The Watchdog of the Soul: The Role of Dogs in the Spiritual Salvation of Robert the Devil." *The Book of Nature and Humanity in the Middle*

Ages and the Renaissance. Eds. David Hawkes and Richard G. Newhauser. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013. 209-221.

Espinosa, Ruben. "Stranger Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 67.1 (Spring 2016): 51-67.

---. and David Ruiter, eds. *Shakespeare and Immigration.* Surrey: Ashgate, 2014.

Estok, Simon Curtis. *Reading the 'Other' Where Fancy is Bred: Designating Strangers in Shakespeare.* U of Alberta, 1996. Dissertation.

Evans, Nicholas. "The Calculation of Columba's Arrival in Britain in Bede's Ecclesiastical History and the Pictish King-Lists." *The Scottish Historical Review* 97.2 (2008): 183-205.

Fackler, Herbert V. "Shakespeare's 'Irregular and Wild' Glendower: The Dramatic Use of Source Materials." *Discourse* 13 (1970): 306-14.

Fackler, Phillip. "Adversus Adversus Iudaeos?: Countering Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Gospel of Nicodemus." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 23.3 (2015): 413-444.

Faletra, Michael A. "Narrating the Matter of Britain: Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Norman Colonization of Wales." *The Chaucer Review* 35.1 (2000): 60-85.

---. "Once and Future Britons: The Welsh in *Lawman's Brut*." *Medievalia et Humanistica* 28 (2002): 1-23.

Fatovic, Clement. "The Anti-Catholic Roots of Liberal and Republican Conceptions of Freedom in English Political Thought." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 66.1 (2005): 37-58.

Federici, Silvia. *Caliban and the Witch.* New York: Autonomedia, 2004.

Felsenstein, Frank. *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes: A Paradigm of Otherness in English Popular Culture, 1660-1830*. Baltimore: JHU Press, 1999.

Fenton, Kirsten A. *Gender, Nation and Conquest in the Works of William of Malmesbury.* Woodbridge: Boydell P, 2008.

---. "Ideas and Ideals of Secular Masculinity in William of Malmesbury." *Women's History Review* 16.5 (November 2007): 755-772.

Fiedler, Leslie A. *The Stranger in Shakespeare.* New York: Stein and Day, 1972.

Fletcher, Phineas, and Estelle Haan. *Locustae, Vel, Pietas Jesuitica*. Leuven: Leuven UP, 1996.

Forster, Katie. "EU Citizens in the UK." *Independent* 13 Oct. 2016. Accessed 23 Mar. 2017.

Forsyth, Neil. "Rebellion in *Paradise Lost*: Impossible Original." *Milton Quarterly* 30.4 (1996): 151-162.

---. *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1987.

---. *The Satanic Epic.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003.

Fowler, David C. "The Middle English Gospel of Nicodemus in Winchester MS 33." *Leeds Studies in English* 19 (1988): 67-83.

Fox, Robert C. "The Character of Moloch in Paradise Lost." *Neuere Sprachen* 9 (1962): 389-395.

Gabel, John B, and Charles B. Wheeler. *The Bible as Literature: An Introduction.* 2nd ed., New York: Oxford UP, 1990.

Gellner, Ernest. *Thought and Change.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1965.

Giancarlo, Matthew. *Parliament and Literature in Late Medieval England*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2007.

---. "Mirror, Mirror: Princely Hermeneutics, Practical Constitutionalism, and the Genres of the English *Fürstenspiegel." Exemplaria* 27.1-2 (Spring/Summer 2015): 35-54.

---. "The Septvauns Affair, Purchase and Parliament in John Gower's *Mirour de L'Omme.*" *Viator* 36 (2005): 435-464.

---. "Murder, Lies, and Storytelling: The Manipulation of Justice(s) in the Parliaments of 1397 and 1399." *Speculum.* 77.1 (Jan., 2002): 76-112.

Gilbert, Allan H. "The Theological Basis of Satan's Rebellion and the Function of Abdiel in Paradise Lost." *Modern Philology: A Journal Devoted to Research in Medieval and Modern Literature* 40.1 (1942): 19-42.

Gillingham, John. "Civilizing the English? The English Histories of William of Malmesbury and David Hume." *Historical Research* 74:183 (February 2001): 17-73.

---. *The English in the Twelfth Century: Imperialism, National Identity, and Political Values*. Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer Ltd, 2000.

Goldman, Jack. "Insight into Milton's Abdiel." *Philological Quarterly* 49 (1970): 249-54.

Goldstein, David B. "Jews, Scots, and Pigs in *The Merchant of Venice." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 54:2 (Spring 2014): 315-348.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture.* New York: Routledge, 1990.

---, gen. ed. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. 9th ed. Vol. A. New York: Norton, 2012.

Gregg, Joan Young. *Devils, Women, and Jews: Reflections of the Other in Medieval Sermon Stories.* Albany: SUNY UP, 1997.

Griffin, Eric. "Shakespeare, Marlowe, and the Stranger Crisis of the Early 1590s." *Shakespeare and Immigration.* Surrey: Ashgate, 2014.

Griffiths, Ralph A. *Wales and the Welsh in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to J. Beverly Smith*. Cardiff: U of Wales Press, 2011.

Haan, Estelle. "Milton's In Quintum Novembris and the Anglo-Latin Gunpowder Epic." *Hermanistica Lovaniensis: Journal of Neo-Latin Studies* 41 (1992): 221-250.

Habib, Imtiaz. "Racial Impersonation on the Elizabethan Stage: The Case of Shakespeare Playing Aaron." *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England* 20 (2007): 17-45.

Hadfield, Andrew. "Milton and Catholicism." *Milton and Toleration*. New York: Oxford UP, 2007. 186-202.

---. *Literature, Politics and National Identity.* New York, Cambridge UP, 1994.

Hakola, R. "The Burden of Ambiguity: Nicodemus and the Social Identity of the Johannine Christians." *New Testament Studies* 55.4 (2009): 438-455.

Hale, John K. "*Paradise Lost:* A Poem in Twelve Books, or Ten?" *Philological Quarterly* 740.20 (Spring 1995): 131-149.

Halio, Jay L. "Scott Colley. Richard's Himself Again: a Stage History of Richard III." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45.3 (1994): 364.

Hall, Alaric, and Matti Kilpiö. *Interfaces between Language and Culture in Medieval England: A Festschrift for Matti Kilpiö.* Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Hall, Kim F. *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early M odern England.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995.

Hammond, Mason. "'Concilia Deorum' from Homer through Milton." *Studies in Philology* 30.1 (Jan., 1933): 1-16.

Hardin, Richard F. *Civil Idolatry: Desacralizing and Monarchy in Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton.* Newark: U of Delaware P, 1992.

Hardy, Duncan. "The Hundred Years War and the 'Creation' of the Written English Vernacular: A Reassessment." *Marginalia* 17 (2013): 18-31.

Harp, Jerry. "'As a Stranger': Sense Metaphors and the Knowing of Self in Hamlet." *Allegorica* 24 (2003): 52-69.

Harris, Stephen J. "Bede and Gregory's Allusive Angles." *Criticism* 44.3 (2002): 271-89.

Hartnup, Karen. *"On the Beliefs of the Greeks": Leo Allatios and Popular Orthodoxy*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Hastings, Adrian. *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Highley, Christopher. *Shakespeare, Spenser, and the Crisis in Ireland.* New York: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Hill, Betty. "A Newly-Identified Middle English Prose Version of the Gospel of Nicodemus." *Notes and Queries. Oxford UP.* 6 (1959): 243.

Hilton, R. H. *Bond Men Made Free: Medieval Peasant Movements and the English Rising of 1381*. London: Temple Smith, 1973.

Hoenselaars, A. J. *Images of Englishmen and Foreigners in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries: A Study of Stage Characters and National Identity in English Renaissance Drama, 1558-1642*. Rutherford: Associated UP, 1992.

---. *Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Holman, Katherine. *The Northern Conquest: Vikings in Britain and Ireland*. Oxford: Minster Books, 2012.

Hone, William, Jeremiah Jones, and William Wake. *The Lost Books of the Bible: Being All the Gospels, Epistles, and Other Pieces Now Extant Attributed in the First Four Centuries to Jesus Christ, His Apostles and Their Companions, Not Included by Its Compilers, in the Authorized New Testament, and the Recently Discovered Syriac Mss. Of Pilate's Letters to Tiberius, Etc.* Bell Pub. Co., 1979.

Horner, Shari. *The Discourse of Enclosure: Representing Women in Old English Literature.* Albany: SUNY P, 2001.

Howlett, D. R. "The Literary Context of Geoffrey of Monmouth: An Essay on the Fabrication of Sources." *Arthuriana* 5.3 (1995): 25-43.

Hunter, William B., Jr. "The Obedience of Christ in Paradise Regained." *Calm of Mind: Tercentenary Essays on Paradise Regained and Samson Agonistes in Honor of John S. Diekhoff.* Cleveland: The P of Case Western Reserve U, 1971. 67-75.

Hutchinson, Mark A. "The Emergence of the State in Elizabethan Ireland and England, Ca. 1575-99." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 45.3 (2014). 659-682.

Hyamson, Albert Montefiore. *A History of the Jews in England.* 2d ed., rev., and extended. London: Methuen, 1928.

Izydorczyk, Zbigniew S. *The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus: Texts, Intertexts, and Contexts in Western Europe*. Tempe: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1997.

"J! Archive - Show #7513, Aired 2017-04-19." *Jeopardy Archive*. 2017. Web. Accessed 29 Apr. 2017.

Jackson, Gabriele Bernhard. "Topical Ideology: Witches, Amazons, and Shakespeare's Joan of Arc." *English Literary Renaissance* 18.1 (1988): 40-65.

Jensen, Gary F. *The Path of the Devil: Early Modern Witch Hunts.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2007.

"Jew and Judean: Have Scholars Erased the Jews from Antiquity?" *A Marginalia Forum.* Multiple contributors. 26 August 2014. Web. Accessed 29 April 2017.

Jin Sunwoo. "Imitatio Christi the Son as Exemplar in Paradise Regained." *Milton and Early Modern English Studies* 15.1 (2005): 155-176.

Johnson, David F. "Hagiographical Demon or Liturgical Devil: Demonology and Baptismal Imagery in Cynewulf's Elene." *Leeds Studies in English* 27 (2006): 9-29.

Johnstone, Nathan. *The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England.* New York: Cambridge UP, 2006.

Jolly, Karen Louise. "Elves in the Psalms?: the Experience of Evil from a Cosmic Perspective." Ed. Alberto Ferreiro. Leiden: Brill, 1998. 19-44.

---. *Popular Religion in Late Saxon England: Elf Charms in Context.* Chapel Hill: U of Chapel Hill P, 1996.

Jones, William Lewis. *King Arthur in History and Legend*. Cambridge: UP 1914.

Justice, Steven. *Writing and Rebellion: England in 1381*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1994.

Kelly, Henry Ansgar. *Satan: A Biography.* New York: Cambridge UP, 2006.

---. "Jews and Saracens in Chaucer's England: A Review of the Evidence." *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 27 (2005): 129-169.

---. *Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeare's Histories.* Boston: Harvard UP, 1970.

Kiernan, Pauline. "The Art of Political Rebellion on Shakespeare's Stage." *Signature Penguin and Random House.* 2017. Web. Accessed 10 September 2017.

Kinney, Alison. *Hood.* Bloomsbury: Bloomsbury: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016.

Kinney, Arthur F. *Lies Like Truth: Shakespeare, Macbeth, and the Cultural Moment.* Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2001.

Kirby, I. J. "Angles and Saxons in La(y)amon's *Brut*." *Studia Neophilologica* 36 (1964): 51-62.

Kleinman, Scott. "The Æþelen of Engle: Constructing Ethnic and Regional Identities in *Laȝamon's Brut*." *Exemplaria* 16.1 (2004): 95-130.

Knoppers, Laura Lunger. *Historicizing Milton: Spectacle, Power, and Poetry in Restoration England.* Athens: U of Georgia P, 1994.

Kolbrener, William. *Milton's Warring Angels: A study of Critical Engagements.* New York: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Kotzor, Günter. "Anglo-Saxon Martyrologists at Work: Narrative Pattern and Prose Style in Bede and the Old English Martyrology." *Leeds Studies in English* 16 (1985): 152-173.

Krapp, George Philip. *The Junius Manuscript*. New York: Columbia UP, 1931.

---. *The Exeter Book*. New York: Columbia UP, 1936.

---. *The Vercelli Book*. New York: Columbia UP, 1932.

Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection.* New York: Columbia UP, 1982.

Kumar, Krishan. *The Making of English National Identity*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Kuruvilla, Carol. "Anti-Muslim Hate Crimes Are Spiking in the U.S. Donald Trump Won't Speak Up." *Huffington Post*.25 Feb. 2017. Web. Accessed 23 Mar. 2017.

Langer, Jessica. "Fake News and the Nation as Imagined Community." *JessicaLanger.Com.* 8 June 2017. Web. Accessed 8 June 2017.

Lamont, Margaret. "Becoming English: Ronwenne's Wassail, Language, and National Identity in the Middle English Prose *Brut.*" *Studies in Philology* 107.3 (2010): 283-309.

Latham, Jacqueline E. M. "'The Tempest' and King James's 'Daemonologie.'" *Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespeare Studies and Production* 28 (1975): 117-23.

Lawrence-Mathers, Anne. *The True History of Merlin the Magician.* Yale UP, 2012.

Learmonth, Nicola K. *Definitions of Obedience in Paradise Regained*. Thesis. University of Otago, 2006.

Lee, Maurice. *The "Inevitable" Union and Other Essays on Early Modern Scotland*. East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 2003.

Lee, Paul. "About Dr. John Dee." *John Dee.org.* 1996. Web. Accessed 27 Nov. 2016.

Lemon, Rebecca. *Treason by Words: Literature, Law, and Rebellion in Shakespeare's England.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2006.

Lever, J. W. "Paradise Lost and the Anglo-Saxon Tradition." *The Review of English Studies* 23.90 (1947): 97-106.

Lewalski, Barbara K., ed. *Paradise Lost.* Malden: Blackwell, 2007.

---. *The Life of John Milton: A Critical Biography*. Malden: John Wiley & Sons, 2008.

Lewis Jones, William. *King Arthur in History and Legend.* New York: Cambridge UP, 1914.

Lexton, Ruth. "Reading the Adulterous/Treasonous Queen in Early Modern England: Malory's Guinevere and Anne Boleyn." *Exemplaria* 2:3 (2005): 222-241.

Lieb, Michael and John T. Shawcross, eds. *"Paradise Lost: A Poem Written in Ten Books": Essays on the 1667 First Edition.* Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 2007.

Lieberman, Max. *The Medieval March of Wales: The Creation and Perception of a Frontier, 1066–1283*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2010.

Lipton, Sara. *Dark Mirror: The Medieval Origins of Anti-Jewish Iconography.* New York: Metropolitan Books/Henry Holt and Company, 2014.

Lisak, Catherine. "Domesticating Strangeness in *Twelfth Night.*" *Twelfth Night: New Critical Essays*, James Schiffer, ed. New York: Routledge, 2011. 167-183.

Liuzza, R. M, ed. *Old English Poetry: An Anthology*. New York: Broadview Press, 2014.

---. "The Devil and His Father: A Case of Editorial Irresponsibility in the Old English Gospels?" *ANQ* 15.2 (2002): 22-28.

---. *The Poems of MS Junius 11: Basic Readings*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Lloyd, Megan S. *"Speak It in Welsh": Wales and the Welsh Language in Shakespeare*. New York: Lexington Books, 2007.

Lodge, David and Nigel Wood, eds. *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*. 3rd ed. New York: Pearson, 2008.

Loewenstein, David. *Representing Revolution in Milton and His Contemporaries: Religion, Politics, and Polemics in Radical Puritanism.* New York: Cambridge UP, 2001.

---. *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature.* New York: Oxford UP, 2013.

--- and Paul Stevens. *Early Modern Nationalism and Milton's England.* Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2008.

Lorino, J. T. *They Actively Serve Who Stand and Wait: The Rudiment of Faithful Obedience Rousing Patient Activity in "Paradise Regained" and "Samson Agonistes."* Southern Illinois University at Carbondale2010. Dissertation.

Lovett, Frank. "Milton's Case for a Free Commonwealth." *American Journal of Political Science* 49.3 (July 2005): 466-478.

McCoy, Dorothy S. "From Celibacy to Sexuality: An Examination of Some Medieval and Early Renaissance Versions of the Story of Robert the Devil." *Human Sexuality in the Middle Ages and Renaissance.* Center for Medieval & Renaissance Studies. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P. 1978.

McGlynn, Sean. "British Nationalism and Europe: A Medieval Comparison." *Politics* 16.3 (1996): 167-174.

MacCulloch, J. A. *The Harrowing of Hell.* New York: AMS Press, 1983.

Macfarlane, Alan. *Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England: A Regional and Comparative Study.* New York: Routledge, 1970/1999.

Magnusson, Lynn. "To 'Gase So Much at the Fine Stranger': Armado and the Politics of English in *Love's Labour's Lost.*" *Shakespeare and the Cultures of Performances,* Patricia Badir, ed. Surrey: Ashgate, 2008. 53-68.

Makhov, Alexander E. "In Diversas Figuras Nequitiae: The Devil's Image from the Viewpoint of Rhetoric." *Angels, Devils: The Supernatural and Its Visual Representation*. Ed. Gerhard Jaritz. Budapest, Hungary: Central European University Department of Medieval Studies and Central European UP, 2011. 29-50.

Malmberg, Lars. "Grendel and the Devil." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 78 (1977): 241-43.

Mannoni, Octave. *Prospero and Caliban: The Psychology of Colonization.* 2nd ed. New York: Praeger, 1964.

Marchant, Alicia. *The Revolt of Owain Glyndŵr in Medieval English Chronicles.* Suffolk: York Medieval Press, 2014.

Marotti, Arthur F. *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts.* Houndmills: Macmillan, 1999.

Marx, C. W. "A Newly Identified Fragment of the Anglo-Norman Prose 'Complaint of Our Lady' and 'Gospel of Nicodemus' in Cambridge University Library MS Dd.4.35." *Notes and Queries* 38 (1991): 157-58.

---. *The Devil's Rights and the Redemption in the Literature of Medieval England.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1995.

---. "The Devil as Narrator of the Life of Christ and Sermo Literarius." *Preaching the Word in Manuscript and Print in Late Medieval England: Essays in Honour of Susan Powell.* Turnhout: Brepols, 2013. 63-81.

Matthews, David. *Writing to the King: Nation, Kingship and Literature 1250-1350.* New York: Cambridge UP, 2010.

McCoy, Dorothy S. "From Celibacy to Sexuality: An Examination of Some Medieval and Early Renaissance Versions of the Story of Robert the Devil." *Human Sexuality in the Middle Ages and Renaissance.* Center for Medieval & Renaissance Studies. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1978.

Meale, Carol M. *Women and Literature in Britain, 1150-1500.* New York: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Mebane, John S. *Renaissance Magic and the Return of the Golden Age: The Occult Tradition and Marlowe, Jonson, and Shakespeare.* Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1989.

Mehan, Uppinder, and David Townsend. "'Nation' and the Gaze of the Other in Eighth-Century Northumbria." *Comparative Literature* 53.1 (2001): 1-26

Melinkoff, Ruth. *The Horned Moses in Medieval Art and Thought.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1970.

Michelson, Hÿman. *The Jew in Early English Literature.* Wilmington: Intellect Books, 1972.

Michelsson, Elisabeth. *Appropriating King Arthur: The Arthurian Legend in English Drama and Entertainments, 1485-1625*. Uppsala: Uppsala U, 1999.

Moe, Alison G. and Thomas H. Luxon. “Publication History of *Paradise Lost.*” *Dartmouth.edu. The Milton Reading Room.* 2016. Web. Accessed 24 December 2016.

---. Mohl, Ruth. *Studies in Spenser, Milton and the Theory of Monarchy.* New York: King’s Crowess, 1949.

Moore, Morgan. *How Wales Was Made So Happy: Exploring Nation and Nonsense in Shakespeare’s Treatment of the Welsh.* Wellesley: Wellesley College, 2015.

Moore, Olin H. “The Infernal Council.” *Modern Philology 16:4 (Aug. 1918):* 169-193.

Morris, Marc. *A Great and Terrible King: Edward I and the Forging of Britain*. New York: Pegasus Books, 2015.

Mottram, Stewart. “Empire, Exile, and England’s ‘British Problem’: Recent Approaches to Spenser’s *Shepheardes Calender* as a Colonial and Postcolonial Text.” *Literature Compass* 4.4 (2007): 1059-1077.

Moulton, Ian Frederick. “‘A Monster Great Deformed’: The Unruly Masculinity of Richard III.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 47.3 (1996).

Myers, Henry Allen, and Herwig. Wolfram. *Medieval Kingship.* Chicago: Nelson Hall, 1982.

Niayeshm, Ladan. “Strangers and Strange Lands in Shakespeare’s *Richard II.” Etudes-Anglaises: Grande-Bretagne* 57:4 (Oct.-Dec.). 399-407.

Neill, Michael. *Putting History to the Question: Power, Politics, and Society in English Renaissance Drama*. New York: Columbia UP, 2000.

Neill, Michael. "Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language, and the Optic of Power in Shakespeare's Histories." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45.1 (Spring 1994): 1-32.

Netzloff, Mark. *England's Internal Colonies: Class, Capital, and the Literature of Early Modern English Colonialism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Nordin, Irene Gilsenan, and Elin Holmsten. *Liminal Borderlands in Irish Literature and Culture.* Oxford: Peter Lang, 2008.

Norwich, John Julius. *Shakespeare's Kings: The Great Plays and the History of England in the Middle Ages, 1337-1485*. New York: Simon & Shuster, 2001.

O'Brien, Eugene. "'What ish my nation?' Towards a Negative Definition of Identity." *Minerva: An Internet Journal of Philosophy* 21 (Nov., 1998). **ACCESS?**

O'Hara, David. "Political Obedience and the State: Elizabethan News Pamphlets and Rebellion in Ireland." *Media History* 21.2 (2015): 123-137.

Obermeier, Anita. "Merlin's Conception by Devil in William Rowley's Play *The Birth of Merlin*." *Arthuriana* 24.4 (2014): 48-79.

---. *The History and Anatomy of Auctorial Self-Criticism in the European Middle Ages.* Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999.

Oldridge, Darren. *The Devil in Tudor and Stuart England.* Gloucestershire: The History P, 2010.

---. *The Devil: A Very Short Introduction.* New York: Oxford UP, 2012.

Ott, Carrie E. "The Rebellion and the Revenger: Allusions and Thematic Echoes from Romans 13 in *Paradise Lost* Book 6." *Notes & Queries* 62.2 (2015): 507-510.

Otter, Monika. *Inventiones: Fiction and Referentiality in Twelfth-Century English Historical Writing.* Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1996.

Pagels, Elaine. *The Origin of Satan: How Christians Demonized Jews, Pagans, and Heretics.* New York: Vintage, 1995.

Paik, Jung-Kook. *Shakespeare's Strangers, Resistance, and State Power.* U of California Davis, 2007. Dissertation.

Pallister, William. *Between Worlds: The Rhetorical Universe of Paradise Lost.* Buffalo: U of Toronto P, 2008.

Partridge, Stephen Bradford, and Erik Kwakkel. *Author, Reader, Book: Medieval Authorship in Theory and Practice.* Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2012.

Pease, Arthur Stanley. "The Attitude of Jerome towards Pagan Literature." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 50 (1919): 150-67.

Poole, Kristen. "When Hell Freezes Over: Mount Hecla and *Hamlet's* Infernal Geography." *Shakespeare Studies* 39 (2011): 152-187.

---. *Supernatural Environments in Shakespeare's England.* New York: Cambridge UP, 2011.

Poole, Robert. *The Lancashire Witches: Histories and Stories*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2002.

Poole, W. Scott. *Satan in America: The Devil We Know.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2010.

Potkay, Monica Brzezinski, and Regula Meyer Evitt. *Minding the Body: Women and Literature in the Middle Ages, 800-1500*. New York: Twayne, 1997.

Prescott, Anne. *Obedience in "Paradise Regained" and "Samson Agonistes."* Thesis. Hunter College, 1982.

Price, Merrall Llewelyn. "Re-membering the Jews: Theatrical Violence in the N-Town Marian Plays." *Comparative Drama* 41.4 (Winter 2007-8): 439-63.

Pryce, Huw. *Power and Identity in the Middle Ages: Essays in Memory of Rees Davies*. New York: Oxford UP, 2007.

Pudney, Eric. "Mendacity and Kingship in Shakespeare's Henry V and Richard III." *European Journal of English Studies* 19.2 (2015): 163-175.

Quint, David. *Inside "Paradise Lost": Reading the Designs of Milton's Epic.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 2014.

Raymond, Joad. *Milton's Angels: The Early-Modern Imagination*. New York: Oxford UP, 2010.

Read, Sophie. "Milton and the Critics: The Reception of Paradise Lost." *Darkness Visible*. 2015. Web. Accessed 13 Mar. 2015.

Revard, Stella Purce. *The War in Heaven: Paradise Lost and the Tradition of Satan's Rebellion.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1980.

Reynolds, Bryan. *Transversal Enterprises in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.

Richman, Gerald. "A Third Choice: Adam, Eve, and Abdiel." *Early Modern Literary Studies: A Journal of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century English Literature* 9.2 (2003): 5 Paragraphs.

Rollinson, David. *A Commonwealth of the People: Popular Politics and England's Long Social Revolution, 1066-1649.* New York: Cambridge UP, 2010.

Rose, E. M. *The Murder of William of Norwich: The Origins of the Blood Libel in Medieval Europe*. New York: Oxford UP, 2015.

Rositzke, Harry August. "The Peterborough Chronicle." *ACLA Humanities e-book.* 2017. Web. Accessed 24 Jan. 2017.

Rowley, Sharon M. "Reassessing Exegetical Interpretations of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*." *Literature and Theology* 17.3 (2003): 227-43.

"Rude, Adj. and Adv." *OED Online*. *Oxford English Dictionary*. 2016. Web. Accessed 5 Nov. 2016.

Rudwin, Maximillian. *The Devil in Legend and Literature.* La Salle: Open Court, 1931.

---. "The Organization of Pandemonium." *The Open Court* 8:2 (1929): 463-473.

Russell, Jeffrey Burton. *Lucifer: The Devil in the Middle Ages*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1984.

---. *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1987.

---. *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1972.

Satin, Joseph Henry. *Shakespeare and His Sources.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

Saul, Nigel. *Richard II*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2008.

Scheil, Andrew P. *The Footsteps of Israel: Understanding Jews in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2004.

Schrader, Emma. *The Divina Commedia and Paradise Lost Reflect Mediaevalism and the Renaissance, Catholicism and Protestantism*. Dissertation. U of Chicago, 1909.

Schreyer, K. "'Here's a Knocking Indeed!' Macbeth and the Harrowing of Hell." *Upstart Crow* 29 (2010): 26-43.

Schwieterman, Patrick Joseph. *Fairies, Kingship, and the British Past in Walter Map's De Nugis Curialium and Sir Orfeo.* Dissertation. UC Berkeley, 2010.

Scragg, Leah. "Iago- Vice or Devil." *Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespeare Studies and Production* 21 (1968): 53-65.

Seitz, Jonathan. *Witchcraft and Inquisition in Early Modern Venice.* New York: Cambridge UP, 2011.

Semple, Hilary. "Alien Darkness: The Real Stranger in *Othello.*" *CRUX* 28.1 (1994): 42-51.

Shapiro, James. *1599: A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare.* New York: Harper, 2005.

---. *Shakespeare and the Jews*. New York: Columbia UP, 1996.

---. *The Year of Lear: Shakespeare in 1606.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 2015.

---. "'What ish my nation?' Shakespeare's Irish Connections." *Irish Times*. 23 April 2016. Web. Accessed 26 October 2016.

Sharma, Manish. "Beyond Nostalgia: Formula and Novelty in Old English Literature." *Exemplaria: A Journal of Theory in Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 26.4 (2014): 307-27.

Shawcross, John T. *With Mortal Voice*. Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 2015.

Shoulson, Jeffrey. *Fictions of Conversion: Jews, Christians, and Cultures of Change in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2013.

Siefker, Phyllis. *Santa Claus, Last of the Wild Men: The Origins and Evolution of Saint Nicholas, Spanning 50,000 Years*. Jefferson: McFarland, 1997.

Silber, Patricia. "'The Develis Perlament': Poetic Drama and a Dramatic Poem." *Mediaevalia.* 3 (1977): 215-28.

Sklar, Elizabeth S. "Ælfric's Life of Saint Edmund: Constructing National Identity." *Medieval Perspectives* 17 (2003): 129-42.

Slaska-Sapala, Kalina. "Milton's Olympian Dialogue: Rereading the First Council Scene in Heaven (Paradise Lost III.56-343)." *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 22.2 (2015). 209-222.

---. "*Paradise Lost* and the Language of Epic Rebellion" *in ASCS 32 Selected Proceedings,* ed. Anne Mackay. 2011. Web. Accessed 1 August 2016.

Slotkin, Joel Elliot. "Honeyed Toads: Sinister Aesthetics in Shakespeare's Richard III." *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 7.1 (2007): 5-32.

Smith, Alan G. R. *The Emergence of a Nation State: The Commonwealth of England, 1529-1660.* 2nd ed. London: Longman, 1997.

Smith, Brendan. *Colonisation and Conquest in Medieval Ireland: The English in Louth, 1170-1330*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1999.

Smith, John Hazel. "Shylock: 'Devil Incarnation' or 'Poor Man . . . Wronged'?" *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 60 (1961): 1-21.

Smuts, Malcolm. "Organized Violence in the Elizabethan Monarchical Republic." *History: The Journal of the Historical Association.* 99.336 (July 2014): 418-443.

Spenser, Edmund, et al. *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition.* Baltimore: JHUP, 1932.

Spenser, Edmund. *A View of the State of Ireland: As It Was in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Written by Way of Dialogue between Eudoxus and Ireneus. By Edmund Spenser. To Which Is Prefix'd the Author's Life, and an Index.* Dublin: Printed for

Laurence Flin, and Ann Watts, 1763. ECCO database; ECCO database. 2016. Web. Accessed 5 June 2016.

Swaim, Kathleen M. *Before and After the Fall: Contrasting Modes in Paradise Lost.* Amherst: The U of Massachusetts P, 1986.

Tamburr, Karl. *The Harrowing of Hell in Medieval England.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2007.

Taufer, Alison. *Holinshed's Chronicles.* Twayne's English Authors Series, TEAS 556. New York: Twayne, 1999.

Thomson, Rodney. "William of Malmesbury's Carolingian Sources." *Journal of Medieval History* 7.4 (1981): 321-337.

---. *William of Malmesbury.* Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1987.

Tomba, Joseph A. *Temptation and Heroic Obedience in Paradise Regained.* Dissertation. Cleveland State University, 1977.

Trachtenberg, Joshua. *The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and Its Relation to Modern Antisemitism.* 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1983.

Treharne, Elaine. *Living Through Conquest: The Politics of Early English, 1029-1220.* New York: Oxford UP, 2012.

Tromly, Frederic B. "Macbeth and His Porter." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 26.2 (1975): 151-156.

Urban, David V. "John Milton, Paradox, and the Atonement: Heresy, Orthodoxy, and the Son's Whole-Life Obedience." *Studies in Philology* 112.4 (2015): 817-836.

van Dijkhuizen, Jan Frans. *Devil Theatre: Demonic Possession and Exorcism in English Renaissance Drama 1558-1642*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2007.

Vaughan Alden T. and Virginia Mason Vaughan. *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1991.

Vaughan, Virginia Mason. *Performing Blackness on English Stages, 1500-1800.* New York: Cambridge UP, 2005.

von Maltzahn, Nicholas. "The First Reception of *Paradise Lost* (1667)." *The Review of English Studies* 47.188 (Nov., 1996): 479-499.

Vos, Nienke, and Willemien Otten. *Demons and the Devil in Ancient and Medieval Christianity.* Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Wade, J. *Fairies in Medieval Romance.* New York: Palgrave. 2011.

Wall-Randell, Sarah. "Doctor Faustus and the Printer's Devil." *SEL Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 48.2 (2008): 259-281.

Walker, William. "*Paradise Lost* and the Forms of Government." *History of Political Thought* 22.2 (Summer 2001): 270-299.

Washington, Edward T. "A Matter of Policy: Reassessing Aaron's Sexual Role in Titus Andronicus" *CLA Journal* 53.1 (2009): 48-74.

Watt, Thomas Irish. *Milton's Visionary Obedience.* Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 2011.

Weiler, Björn. "William of Malmesbury on Kingship." *History* 90.297 (2005): 3-22.

Weiskott, Eric. "Feeling 'British.'" *Part XIII of The Public Medievalist's Continuing Series on Race, Racism and the Middle Ages.* 28 March 2017. Web. Accessed 28 March 2017.

White, Paul Whitfield. "The Admiral's Men, Shakespeare, and the Lost Arthurian Plays of Elizabethan England." *Arthuriana* 24.4 (2014): 33-47.

Wickham, Glynne. "Hell-Castle and Its Door-Keeper. *Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespeare Studies and Production* 19 (1966): 68-74.

Wilcockson, Colin. "The Harrowing of Hell Motif in Shakespeare's Macbeth." *Anglistik* 14.2 (2003): 63-70.

Williams, Arnold. "The Motivation of Satan's Rebellion in *Paradise Lost.*" *Studies in Philology* 42 (Jan., 1945): 253-268.

Wills, Garry. *Witches and Jesuits: Shakespeare's Macbeth.* New York: New York Public Library, 1995.

Wilson, Richard. "Making Men of Monsters: Shakespeare in the Company of Strangers." *Shakespeare???* 1.1-2 (13 Dec 2006): 8-28.

---. "'And mine is a sad one': Antonio as Stranger in *Twelfth Night.*" *Shakespeare Bulletin* 2.11 (Sept.-Oct. 1984): 5-7.

Williams, Robert A. Jr. *Savage Anxieties: The Invention of Western Civilization.* New York: St. Martin's P, 2012.

Wittreich, Joseph. "'All Angelic Natures Joined in One': Epic Convention and Prophetic Interiority in the Council Scenes of Paradise Lost." *Milton Studies* 17 (1983): 43-74.

Woolf, R. E. *Art and Doctrine: Essays on Medieval Literature.* London: The Hambledon Press, 1986.

---. "The Devil in Old English Poetry." *The Review of English Studies* 4.13 (1953): 1-12.

Yaneva, Rozaliya. *Misrule and Reversals: Carnivalesque Performances in Christopher Marlowe's Plays*. München: Herbert Utz Verlag, 2013.

Young, Arthur Milton. *Troy and Her Legend*. Pittsburg: U of Pittsburgh P., 1948.

Young, Helen. "Where Do the 'White Middle Ages' Come from?" *The Public Medievalist* 21 Mar. 2017. Web. Accessed 23 Mar. 2017.